THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

616952

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES.

FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

6 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CLX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FOURTH DAY OF JULY TO THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JULY, 1906

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION

1906.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON

8472

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.: Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 WILL. I. to 34 GEO. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 GEO. III. to 40 GEO. III.
1760-1800

(FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 35 ....41 GEO. III..........1801
— 36 ....42 — 1802

(SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 36 ....42 GEO. III. 1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(SECOND PARLIAMENT—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2...44 GEO. III.......1803-4
— 3 to 5...45 — 1805
— 6 & 7...46 — 1806

(THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 8 & 9...47 GEO. III. 1806-7

(FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 9 to 11...48 GEO. III. 1807-8
— 12 — 14...49 — 1809
— 15 — 17...50 — 1810
— 18 — 20...51 — ... 1810-11
— 21 — 23...52 — 1812

(FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 24 to 26...53 GEO. III. ... 1812-13
— 27 & 28...54 — 1813-14
— 29 to 31...55 — ... 1814-15
— 32 — 34...56 — 1816
— 35 & 36...57 — 1817
— 37 — 38...58 — 1818

(SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 & 40...59 GEO. III. 1819
— 41 ....60 — ... 1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830

(SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 GEO. IV. 1820
— 4 & 5... 2 — 1821
— 6 — 7... 3 — 1822
— 8 — 9... 4 — 1823
— 10 — 11... 5 — 1824
— 12 — 13... 6 — 1825-6
— 14 — 15... 7 — 1826

(EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 16 .... 7 GEO. IV. 1826
— 17 .... 8 — 1827
— 18 & 19... 9 — 1828
— 20 — 21...10 — 1829
— 22 to 25...11 — 1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol.	1 to 3	1	Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol.	4 to 8	2	Will. IV.	1832
—	9 — 14	3	—	1831

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol.	15 to 20	4	Will. IV.	1833
—	21 — 25	5	—	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol.	26 to 30	6	Will. IV.	1835
—	31 — 35	7	—	1836
—	36 — 38	8	—	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 — 107	12	—	1849
—	108 — 113	13	—	1850
—	114 — 118	14	—	1851
—	119 — 122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 — 135	17	—	1854
—	136 — 139	18	—	1855
—	140 — 143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 — 151	21	—	1858
—	152 — 153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 — 160	23	—	1860
—	161 — 164	24	—	1861
—	165 — 168	25	—	1862
—	169 — 172	26	—	1863
—	173 — 176	27	—	1864
—	177 — 180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 — 189	30	—	1867
—	190 — 193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 — 203	33	—	1870
—	204 — 208	34	—	1871
—	209 — 213	35	—	1872
—	214 — 217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 — 226	38	—	1875
—	227 — 231	39	—	1876
—	232 — 236	40	—	1877
—	237 — 242	41	—	1878
—	243 — 249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 — 265	44	—	1881
—	266 — 273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 — 292	47	—	1884
—	293 — 301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 — 332	51	—	1888
—	333 — 340	52	—	1889
—	341 — 348	53	—	1890
—	349 — 356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	VICTORIA	1892

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	7	56	VICTORIA	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	36	59	VICTORIA	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	88	64	VICTORIA	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*

Vol.	89	1	EDWARD VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	1905

(TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol.	152 to 160	6	EDWARD VII.	1906

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION, DECEMBER 1905.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crewe.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Loreburn.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
  Home Department——Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P
  Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt., M.P.
  Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
  War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P.
  India Office——Rt. Hon. John Morley, M.P.
First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland——Not in the Cabinet.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. James Bryce, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most. Hon Marquess of Ripon.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sydney Buxton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Fowler, M.P.
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——Lord Fitzmaurice.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——Herbert Samuel, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Winston Churchill, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——Rt. Hon. J. E. Ellis, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Portsmouth.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——George Whiteley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——Thomas Lough, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. E. Robertson, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——H. E. Kearley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——Walter Runciman, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Reginald McKenna, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office——T. R. Buchanan, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Treasury——
  J. A. Pease, Esq., M.P.
  Herbert Lewis, Esq., M.P.
  Captain Cecil Norton, M.P.
  J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.
Lords of the Admiralty——
  Admiral Sir John Fisher.
  Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury.
  Captain H. B. Jackson.
  Captain F. S. Inglefield.
Army Council——
  The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
  Lieut.-General Hon. Sir W. G. Lyttelton.
  Lieut.-General C. W. H. Douglas.
  Lieut.-General Sir W. G. Nicholson.
  Major-General Sir J. W. Murray.
  The Under Secretary of State for War.
  The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
  Secretary. The Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. Ward).
The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——George Lambert, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.
The Lord Advocate——Thomas Shaw, Esq., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——In the Cabinet.
Attorney-General——J. Lawson Walton, Esq., M.P.
Solicitor-General——W. S. Robson, Esq., M.P.
Paymaster-General——R. K. Causton, Esq., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Lord Steward——Rt. Hon. Earl of LIVERPOOL.
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of ELIBANK, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount ALTHORP.
Vice-Chamberlain——WENTWORTH BEAUMONT, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of SEFTON.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of MANCHESTER.
Lords-in-Waiting——
  Earl GRANVILLE.
  Earl of GRANARD.
  Lord HAMILTON of DALZELL.
  Lord ACTON.
  Lord DENMAN.
  Lord COLEBROKE.
  Lord SUFFIELD.
Judge Advocate-General——T. MILVAIN, Esq., K.C.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. JOHN SINCLAIR.
Lord High Constable——Earl of ERROL.
Lord Privy Seal——
Master of the Household——Duke of ARGYLL, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord COLEBROOKE.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord Justice General——
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. THOMAS SHAW, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Solicitor-General——ALEXANDER URE, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir STAIR AGNEW, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. LEACH, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of ABERDEEN, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. JAMES BRYCE, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir A. MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord HERSCHELL and WALTER CALLAN, Esq.
State Steward and Chamberlain——Viscount HAWKESBURY, M.V.O.
Controller to the Lord-Lieutenant's Household——Viscount POWERSCOURT, M.V.O.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice WALKER.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R. CHERRY, K.C.
Solicitor-General——REDMOND BARRY, Esq., K.C.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord GRENFELL, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
Other Clerks——Hon. A. McDonnell ; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills) ; H. P. St. John, Esq.; V. M. Biddulph, Esq. ; Hon. E. A. Stonor ; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq. ; C. Headlam, Esq. ; J. B. Hotham, Esq. ; E. C. Vigors, Esq. ; A. Tennyson, Esq. ; and G. D. Luard, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. A. Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, A. N. Stoll, J. W. F. Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler.
Attendant——Mr. W. Worfell.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq. ; Clerk——H. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir F. H. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M.V.O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. C. J. Williams.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. Patey.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
Committee Office——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.
Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——H. C. Tower, Esq. ; C. V. Frere, Esq. ; G. C. Giffard, Esq.; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart., S. L. Simeon, Esq. ; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Horace West, Esq. ; Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq. ; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. ; Percy A. Bull, Esq. ; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq. ; W. E. Grey, Esq. ; F. C. Holland, Esq. ; J. W. G. Bond, Esq. ; H. C. Dawkins, Esq. ; R. P. Colomb, Esq.
Junior Clerks——B. H. Fell, Esq. ; R. E. Childers, Esq. ; J. Scott Porter, Esq., F. C. Bramwell, Esq. ; W. T. Legge, Esq., C. R. Turner, Esq. ; W. K. Gibbons, Esq. ; K. J. C. Moorsom, Esq. ; R. D. Radcliffe, Esq. ; W. P. Johnston, Esq. ; J. Barlow, Esq. ; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. Erskine, Esq. C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. Gosset, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. Erskine, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. Shearn.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon Basil Wilberforce, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. Edward Gully, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. Chandos Leigh, K.C., K.C.B.
Trainbearer——Mr. J. French.
Messenger——Mr. W. Murrell.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. Lockton, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
Taxing Master——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Vote Office——
    Principal Clerk——Philip Smith, Esq.
    Assistant Clerks——John Poyser, Esq. ; W. K. Sanderson, Esq.
    Messenger——Mr. John Edwards.
Librarian——R. C. Walpole, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——A. E. A. W. Smyth, Esq. Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. Crimp, Wm. Stewart ; Messengers——Messrs. A. Firmin, W. Hague.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Printers——
    Journals——G. E. Briscoe Eyre, Esq.
    Votes——J. B. Nichols, Esq.
Postmaster——Mr. I. Lincoln ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. Glynn.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. Bullock.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. Fielden Mitchell.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. Taylor.
Messengers——Messrs. C. Davie, H. Jones, G. D. Weller, J. Armstrong, J. Woodward, J. Ivory, G. Norman, J. Surrey A. Sepple.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. Inglefield and Mr. H Hambling.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. Woodcraft, Mr. R. Robertson, Mr. J. Hills, Mr. J. Sprague, Mr. A. Andrews, Mr. T. B. Spray, Mr. G. Anstey, Mr. J. H. Day, Mr. J. Henderson,
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. G. Wainwright, J. Guyatt, R. Turtle, A. Haskell, A. C. Johnson, G. Clapperton, H. E. Linington, H. G. Emmett, J. L. Philip, W. Findlay.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. Henley ; Assistant——Mr. W. Broadbent ; Porters——Messrs. J. Oram and J. Hart.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. Scantlebury.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CLX.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1906.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 4TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

Kettering Water Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered and agreed to .. 1

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*) (King's Consent signified.)

Bill read the third time and passed 1

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed 1

Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation) Bill [LORDS].—To be read a second time To-morrow 1

Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and committed .. 2

London and India Docks and Millwall Dock Companies Bill.—Order March 5th that the London and India Docks and Millwall Dock Companies Bill be committed, read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*) 2

Sutton District Water Bill.—Reported. Report to lie upon the Table .. 2

Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [July 3rd], "That the Promoters of the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill which has been introduced into this House in the present session of Parliament shall have leave to suspend any further proceedings thereon in order to proceed with the same Bill, if they shall think fit, in the next session of Parliament,

July 4.] Page

provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session, and that all fees due thereon up to that period be paid: That the money deposited in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House in respect of such Bill may thereupon be returned to the depositors: That the Promoters of such Bill may, on or before December 31st next, deposit in the Private Bill Office an Estimate, signed by the person making the same, of the expense of the undertaking under the Bill, and, previously to January 15th next, deposit a sum not less than five per cent. on the amount of such Estimate with the Paymaster-General: That such Bill shall be referred to the Examiners, who shall certify whether or not the Promoters have made such deposit with the Paymaster-General, and, upon the Examiners certifying that such deposit has been made, that the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to all other stages through which the same shall have passed in the present Session and no new fees shall be charged in regard to such stages: That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit in the next session of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto signed by the agent stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present session. That if the money deposited in the present session, as required by Standing Order No. 57, in respect of such Bill has not been withdrawn as provided for by the preceding resolutions a certificate of that fact from the proper officer of the court in which such money was deposited shall accompany such declaration, and such Bill shall not be referred to the Examiners: That such Bill, indorsed by one of the Clerks in the Private Bill Office as having been duly deposited with such declaration and such certificate, if any, annexed, be laid by one of the Clerks of that Office upon the Table of the House in the next session of Parliament: That such Bill, so laid upon the Table, shall be deemed to have been read a first time: That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to such Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present session: That all Petitions presented in the present session against such Bill shall stand referred to the Committee on the Bill in the next session of Parliament, and that all Notices and grounds of objections to the right of Petitioners to be heard, given in the present session within the time prescribed by the Rules of the Referees relating to such Notices, shall be held applicable in the next session of Parliament; That no Petitioners shall be heard before the Committee on such Bill unless their Petition shall have been presented within the time limited in the present session or in respect of which Standing Order No. 128 has been dispensed with in the present session, or unless their Petition shall be presented on or before February 12th, 1907."—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Question again proposed.

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Promoters of the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill which has been introduced into this House in the present session of Parliament shall have leave to suspend any further proceedings thereon in order to proceed with the same Bill, if they shall think fit, in the next session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session and that all fees due thereon up to that period be paid.

That the money deposited in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House in respect of such Bill may thereupon be returned to the depositors.

That the promoters of such Bill may, on or before the 31st day of December next, deposit in the Private Bill Office an estimate, signed by the person making the same, of the expense of the undertaking under the Bill, and, previously to the 15th day of January next, deposit a sum not less than 5 per cent. on the amount of such estimate with the Paymaster-General.

That such Bill shall be referred to the examiners, who shall certify whether or not the promoters have made such deposit with the Paymaster-General, and, upon the examiners certifying that such deposit has been made, that the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to all other stages through which the same shall have passed in the present session, and no new fees shall be charged in regard to such stages.

That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit in the next session of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto signed by the agent stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present session.

That if the money deposited in the present session, as required by Standing Order No. 57, in respect of such Bill has not been withdrawn as provided for by the preceding resolutions a certificate of that fact from the proper officer of the court in which such money was deposited shall accompany such declaration, and such Bill shall not be referred to the Examiners.

That such Bill, indorsed by one of the Clerks in the Private Bill Office as having been duly deposited with such declaration and such certificate, if any, annexed, be laid by one of the Clerks of that Office upon the Table of the House in the next session of Parliament.

That such Bill, so laid upon the Table, shall be deemed to have been read a first time.

That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to such Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present session.

That all Petitions presented in the present session against such Bill shall stand referred to the Committee on the Bill in the next session of Parliament, and that all notices and grounds of objections to the right of Petitioners to be heard, given in the present session within the time prescribed by the Rules of the Referees relating to such notices, shall be held applicable in the next session of Parliament.

That no Petitioners shall be heard before the Committee on such Bill unless their Petition shall have been presented within the time limited in the present session or in respect of which Standing Order No. 128 has been dispensed with in the present session, or unless their Petition shall be presented on or before the 12th day of February, 1907.

Ordered, That this Order be a Standing Order of the House.

Ordered, That a message be sent to the Lords to acquaint them therewith and desire their concurrence.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*) .. 2

July 4.]

Page

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Adwell and South Weston; Ancroft; Aston Rowant; Britwell Salome and Britwell Prior; Chinnor; Cuxham and Easington; Ewelme; Lewknor; Pishill Pyrton; Stoke Talmage; Clare and Wheatfield; Sydenham (Oxford); and Watlington; to lie upon the Table 6

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).—Petitions against alteration of Law: from Abberton; Cartmel; and Darley (two); to lie upon the Table 6

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Govan, in favour; to lie upon the Table 6

JUVENILE SMOKING BILL.—Petition from Govan, in favour; to lie upon the Table 6

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 6

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].—Petitions for alteration: from Birkenhead; Doncaster; Hull (two); Lewisham; and West Ham (two); to lie upon the Table 7

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.—Petition from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the aable 7

VAGRANT CHILDREN BILL.—Petition from Ulverston, in favour; to lie upon the Table 7

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3663 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 7

COMPANIES (WINDING UP).—Copy presented, of fifteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 232] 7

SUPERANNUATIONS.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated June 28th, 1904, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Keeper of the National Gallery of British Art at Millbank, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 7

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated June 28th, 1906, declaring that Leonardo de Santo, Foreman, His Majesty's Office of Works, Constantinople, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 7

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of List of Boroughs and Urban Districts in England and Wales with a population of 5,000 and upwards in which there are no Council Schools [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 7

July 4.] Page

Training Colleges for Elementary Teachers.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered March 20th ; *Dr. Macnamara*] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 233] 8

Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Act, 1865.—Account presented, of the Receipts and Expenditure under the Act for the year 1905 [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 234] 8

Fines, etc. (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Abstract of Accounts of Fines accounted for by the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks for 1904 [by Act] ; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 235] 8

Paper Laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—Lunacy, Copy of Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the number of patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ending on the 30th June, 1906 [by Act] 8

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

" Britannia " Cadets—Instructions in Handling Open Boats under Sails, Etc.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover) ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 8

The Hague Conference and Naval Expenditure.—Question, Mr. Thomasson (Leicester) ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 8

Evening Delivery of Letters in Caithness-shire.—Question, Mr. R. L. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire) ; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 9

Vagrancy—Recommendations of Commission.—Question, Mr. Brodie (Surrey, Reigate) ; Answer, Mr. John Burns 9

Locomotives on Highways.—Question, Mr. J. Hope (Fifeshire, W.) ; Answer, Mr. John Burns 10

Indian Educational Appointments.—Question, Dr. Hazel (West Bromwich) ; Answer, Mr. Morley 10

Hours of Labour for Women and Young Persons in Textile Mills—India.—Question, Mr. Gill (Bolton) ; Answer, Mr. Morley 11

Executive and Judicial Functions in India.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) ; Answer, Mr. Morley 11

Execution in India—Appeals.—Question, Mr. Weir ; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 12

Boycott of British Goods in Bengal.—Question, Mr. Weir ; Answer, Mr. Morley 12

Vaccination of Recruits for the Swiss Army.—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 12

Indian Law Students and the Inns of Court Rifle Volunteers.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 13

July 4.] *Page*

DESTRUCTION OF ARMY EMERGENCY RATIONS.—Question, Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central); Answer, Mr. Haldane 13

SUGGESTED LOAN BY THE GOVERNMENT OF RIFLES AND MORRIS TUBES TO CIVILIAN RIFLE CLUBS.—Question, Captain Kincaid Smith (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon); Answer, Mr. Haldane 14

SALARIES OF IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 14

LABOUR RECRUITMENT IN THE LAKE PROVINCE OF BRITISH CENTRAL AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 14

ITALIAN IMPORT DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Armitage (Leeds, Central); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 15

SUGGESTED REORGANISATION OF THE SANITARY AND MEDICAL STAFF OF THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 17

TRUNK TELEPHONE CONNECTION BETWEEN LIMERICK AND TRALEE.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 19

RETURN OF WORKING OF THE WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY ACT.—Question, Mr. H. C. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 19

EDUCATION BILL—SCHOOLS CONNECTED WITH INSTITUTIONS.—Question, Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton); Answer, Mr. Birrell 19

PUBLICATION OF EDUCATION RETURN.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 20

PUBLICATION OF RESULT OF BOY CLERKS' EXAMINATION.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 20

MOTOR TRAFFIC—DAMAGE TO PROPERTY BY DUST.—Question, Colonel Warde (Kent, Medway); Answer, Mr. John Burns 21

NATIONAL VACCINE ESTABLISHMENT'S STOCK OF LYMPH.—Question, Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 21

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

HIS MAJESTY'S SHIP "MONTAGU"—Question, Mr. Maclean (Bath); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) .. 21

RECLAMATION OF WASTE LANDS IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 22

INDIAN GOVERNMENT RECORDS.—Question, Dr. Hazel (West Bromwich); Answer, Mr. Morley 22

THE CALCUTTA MADRASCAH.—Question, Dr. Hazel; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 23

July 4.]

Page

CHINESE COOLIES IN SOUTH AFRICA—THE REPATRIATION NOTICE.—Questions, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.), Mr. Paul (Northampton), Mr. T. M. Healy (Louth, N.), Mr. Rees, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. 23

TRANSVAAL NORTHERN RAILWAY BONDS.—Questions, Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London); Answers, Mr. Churchill 26

CRŒSUS MINE MANAGER.—Questions, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury), Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answers, Mr. Churchill 26

NEW COMET MINE—MR. THOMAS RATCLIFFE.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Churchill 27

CEYLON PEARL FISHERIES.—Questions, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire), Mr. Menzies (Lanarkshire, S.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 27

COMPULSORY VACCINATION IN SWITZERLAND.—Question, Mr. Lupton; Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury, for Sir Edward Grey) 28

DOG TAX ASSESSORS.—Question, Mr. Sears (Cheltenham); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 29

TAX ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION.—Question, Mr. Sears; Answer, Mr. Asquith 30

INCOME TAX COLLECTORS.—Question, Mr. Sears; Answer, Mr. Asquith 31

INSPECTORS OF MINES.—Questions, Mr. J. Williams (Glamorganshire, W.), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answrs, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 31

LOST PROPERTY REWARDS.—Question, Mr. T. Davies (Fulham); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 32

SWISS POST OFFICE OFFICIALS AND VACCINATION.—Questions, Mr. Lupton and Mr. T. M. Healy; Answers, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 33

BRITISH MAILS ON GERMAN BOATS.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 33

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.—Question, Mr. Beauchamp (Suffolk, Lowestoft); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 33

TOXTETH RELIEVING OFFICER.—Question, Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby); Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 34

POPLAR INQUIRY.—Question, Sir Frederick Banbury; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 34

POPLAR RECEIVING HOUSE FOR CHILDREN.—Question, Sir Frederick Banbury; Answer, Mr. Runciman 35

BELMONT IMBECILE ASYLUM.—Question, Dr. Sutton Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer, Mr. Runciman 35

July 4.]

Page

VACCINATION OF TEACHERS.—Questions, Mr. Lupton; Answers, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) .. 35

TREASURY GRANT TO WELSH INTERNATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Gibbs (Bristol, W.); Answer, Mr. Lough 36

DIPTON CATHOLIC SCHOOL.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answers, Mr. Lough 36

GOVERNMENT ABSTRACTORS' PENSION.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire) 37

THE MALL.—Question, Mr. T. Davies; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale) 37

LAND REGISTRATION IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 38

LEWIS—LOCAL TAXATION.—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Mr. Sinclair .. 38

MEDICAL STATISTICS FOR THE ISLAND OF LEWIS.—Questions, Mr. Weir; Answers, Mr. Sinclair 39

EVICTED TENANTS AND UNTENANTED LAND.—Questions, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 39

IRISH EMIGRATION—THE LABOURERS BILL.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 40

DROMAHANE EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 40

MR. TEMPLEMAN'S BUTTEVANT ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Bryce 41

WORK OF THE IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—Questions, Mr. Ginnell and Mr. Flynn; Answers, Mr. Bryce 41

THE ROBERT TYNDALL ESTATE, COUNTY KILKENNY.—Question, Mr. O'Mara (Kilkenny, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 42

CONGESTED DISTRICT BOARD'S RECORDS.—Questions, Mr. John Roche (Galway, E.), Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 43

MR. LEADER'S BANTEER (CORK ESTATE).—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Bryce 45

KILKEANY LANDS, KILKENNY.—Question, Mr. O'Mara; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 45

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD'S LAND PURCHASES.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Bryce 46

CORK AGRICULTURAL SCHEMES.—Question, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 46

July 4.] *Page*

IRISH LAND PRICES—HOLDINGS WITHIN THE ZONES.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 47

IRISH RETURNS.—Questions, Colonel McCalmont (Antrim, E.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 48

BRUFF EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce.. 48

THE ROYAL CANAL.—Question, Mr. J. R. Farrell (Longford); Answer, Mr. Bryce 49

IRISH CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE OF EDUCATION.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.), Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 49

TREASURY GRANTS FOR IRISH SCHOOL BUILDINGS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 50

BALLINAMORE RATE COLLECTOR.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 50

CLOGHER COUNCIL AND THE LABOURERS BILL.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, Mr. Bryce 51

WOODFORD BRANCH OF THE UNITED IRISH LEAGUE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 52

HEAD CONSTABLE SPENCE, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 52

WOODFORD DOG LICENCE PROSECUTION.—Questions, Mr. John Roche, Mr. Kilbride; Answers, Mr. Bryce 53

IRISH LUNACY GRANTS.—Questions, Captain Donelan (Cork, E.), Mr. T. M. Healy, and Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Bryce 53

KNOCKADERRY EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 54

LIMERICK EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 55

IRISH LAND APPEALS.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 55

DONAGHMORE GLEBE NATIONAL SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University); Answer, Mr. Bryce 56

LONGFORD POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 57

DRING TELEGRAPH LINE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 57

BELFONT POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 57

IRISH TRADE STATISTICS.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.), Mr. Flynn, Mr. Flavin; Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 57

July 4.] *Page*

EXPIRING LAWS.—Questions, Mr. O'Mara and Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 58

IRISH HOME RULE.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 59

MR. JUSTICE GRANTHAM.—Question, Mr. Arkwright (Hereford); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 59

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., without Amendment.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 236.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 236.]

Bill to be considered To-morrow 60

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment Bill.—Order for Second Reading To-morrow read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn .. 60

NEW BILLS.

Education (Scotland) Act (1872) Amendment Bill.—"To amend The Education (Scotland) Act, 1872," presented by Mr. Leicester Harmsworth; supported by Mr. Weir, Mr. Rainy, Mr. Ainsworth, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Annan Bryce, Mr. Cathcart Wason, and Mr. John Dewar; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 294.] 60

Recorders, Stipendiary Magistrates, and Clerks of the Peace Bill.—"To make provision as to the appointment of deputies for Recorders, Stipendiary Magistrates, and Clerks of the Peace, and for the temporary performance of the duties of those officers in cases of vacancies," presented by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 295.] 60

Rights of Way (Scotland) Bill.—"To amend the law relating to Rights of Way in Scotland," presented by Mr. Gulland; supported by Mr. Annan Bryce, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Major McMicking, Mr. C. E. Price, and Mr. Dundas White; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 296.] 60

Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill.—Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Order [June 15th] for committal of Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill to the Standing Committee on Law, etc., be discharged, and that the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 61
The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 61
Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 62
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 62
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 63

Question put, and agreed to

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 8 :—

Mr. Ashley (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 66

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, after the word 'trusts,' to insert the words 'and the Charity Commissioners are satisfied that the object of the trust is solely educational.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Healy (*Louth, N.*) 67
The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) ... 67

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 5, to omit the word 'where.'"—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'where' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 70
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 71
Mr. Dillon (*Mayo, E.*) 72
Major Seely (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) 72
Mr. Blake (*Longford, N.*) 72

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, after the word 'trusts,' insert the words 'and the Charity Commissioners are satisfied that the object of the trust is solely educational.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 73
Mr. A. J. Balfour 74
The Attorney-General (*Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.*) 75
Mr. A. J. Balfour 76
Mr. T. M. Healy 77
Mr. Astbury (*Lancashire, Southport*) 78
Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 80
Mr. Birrell 82
Mr. Wyndham (*Dover*) 83
Mr. Perks (*Lincolnshire, Louth*) 84

July 4.] Page

Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 85
Mr. Dillon 86
Mr. Herbert (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) 87
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 89
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 91
Sir E. Carson (Dublin University) 92
The Solicitor-General (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) 93
Mr. T. M. Healy 94
Mr. Burdett-Coutts (Westminster) 95
Sir W. Robson 96

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 5, line 6, after the word " trusts " to insert the words " for educational purposes only."—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question put, " That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 167 ; Noes, 306. (Division List No. 187.)

Mr. Cave 101

Amendment proposed—

" In page 5, line 6, after the word " authority " to insert the words " or the owners of the schoolhouse."—(*Mr. Cave.*) .. .. ..

Question proposed, " That those words be inserted."

Mr. Birrell 103
Sir William Anson 104
Major Seely 105
Mr. T. M. Healy 105
Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) 106
Mr. A. J. Balfour 107
Mr. Herbert 109
Mr. Dillon 109
Mr. Birrell 110
Mr. T. M. Healy 112

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 109 ; Noes, 247. (Division List No. 188.)

Sir William Anson 117

Amendment proposed—

" In page 5, line 9, to leave out the word ' seven ' and to insert the word ' eight.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' seven ' stand part of the clause."

July 4.] Page

Mr. Birrell .. 118
Mr. Rawlinson .. 119
Mr. Blake .. 120
Mr. Bridgeman (*Shropshire, Oswestry*) .. 120
Sir William Anson .. 120
Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) .. 121

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Rawlinson .. 121

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, lines 9 and 10, to leave out the words 'Commission appointed under this Act,' and to insert the words 'Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Micklem (*Hertfordshire, Watford*) .. 123
Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) .. 124
Mr. Blake .. 124
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (*Mr. Lough, Islington, W.* .. 124
Sir William Anson .. 125

Question put and agreed to.

Sir William Anson .. 125

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 10, to leave out from the word 'scheme,' to the end of subsection (1), and insert the words 'for the use of the schoolhouse for the purpose of a public elementary school in accordance with the trust of the schoolhouse.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Lough .. 126
Lord Balcarres .. 126
Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) .. 127
Sir W. Robson .. 128
Sir E. Carson .. 128

Question put.
The Committee divided :—Ayes, 282 ; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 189.)

Lord R. Cecil .. 133

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 16, to leave out from the word 'court,' down to the word 'such' in line 39, and to insert the words 'and shall have regard to.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

July 4.] *Page*

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'sufficient,' in line 19, stand part of the clause."

Sir W. Robson 135
Mr. A. J. Balfour 136
Mr. Birrell 140
Mr. Evelyn Cecil (*Aston Manor*) 142
Mr. Wyndham 143
Mr. R. Pearce (*Staffordshire, Leek*) 144
Sir E. Carson 146

Whereupon Mr. Birrell rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 320; Noes, 151. (Division List No. 190.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'sufficient,' in line 19, stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 320; Noes, 150. (Division List No. 191.)

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Musical Copyright Bill.—Order for the House to be put into Committee read.

Mr. T. P. O'Connor (*Liverpool, Scotland*) 155
Mr. Harwood (*Bolton*) 155
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.*) 156

Consideration of the Bill deferred.

And, it being half-past Eleven of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.
Adjourned at half after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, JULY 5TH, 1906.

Earldom of Norfolk.—A witness ordered to attend the Committee for Privileges this day and produce documents 157

Earldom of Norfolk.—Committee for Privileges met: Counsel further heard on behalf of the claimant, Lord Mowbray: A witness examined: Counsel heard to open the case on behalf of the Duke of Norfolk: Committee adjourned till To-morrow 157

Lord Graves (Claim to Vote for Representative Peers for Ireland).—Ordered, that all deeds, documents, and papers produced on behalf of the Petitioner by his agent be delivered to the said agent 157

July 5.] *Page*

Worcester Election.—The Lord Steward acquainted the House that His Majesty had appointed To-morrow, at Buckingham Palace, to receive the Address of both Houses on the said election : A message sent to the Commons to inform them thereof, and that the Lords had appointed the Lord Steward and the Captain of the Gentlemen-at-Arms to present the Address on the part of this House, and to desire the Commons to appoint a proportionate number of its Members to present the said Address with their Lordships 157

Sat First.—The Earl of Romney sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 157

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Cardiff Gas Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 157

Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported, with Amendments 157

Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway Bill [H.L.] ; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill [H.L.].—Commons' Amendments considered, and agreed to 158

Cork City Railways and Works Bill.—Moved, That the Order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a ; agreed to. Bill read 2^a and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 158

Midland Railway Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments ; further Amendments made. Bill passed, and returned to the Commons 158

Uxbridge Gas Bill.—Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 158

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Brought from the Commons. Read 1^a, and referred to the Examiners 158

Bury Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons, agreed to, with Amendments 158

Clacton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.] ; Newport Harbour Commissioners Bill [H.L.] ; Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund) Bill [H.L.] ; Sheffield District Railway Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered and agreed to 158

Kettering Water Bill.—Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to 158

Hammersmith, City and North East London Railway Bill.—Message from the Commons to acquaint this House that they have made the following Order, to which they desire the concurrence of their Lordships.

Ordered, That the promoters of the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill, which has been introduced into this House in the present session of Parliament, shall have leave to suspend any further

July 5.] *Page*

proceedings thereon in order to proceed with the same Bill, if they shall think fit, in the next session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session, and that all fees due thereon up to that period be paid.

That the money deposited in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House in respect of such Bill may thereupon be returned to the depositors.

That the promoters of such Bill may, on or before the 31st day of December next, deposit in the Private Bill Office an estimate, signed by the person making the same, of the expense of the undertaking under the Bill, and, previously to the 15th day of January next, deposit a sum not less than 5 per centum on the amount of such estimate with the Paymaster-General.

That such Bill shall be referred to the Examiners, who shall certify whether or not the promoters have made such deposit with the Paymaster-General, and, upon the Examiners certifying that such deposit has been made, that the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to all other stages through which the same shall have passed in the present session, and no new fees shall be charged in regard to such stages.

That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit in the next session of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto signed by the agent stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present session.

That if the money deposited in the present session, as required by Standing Order No. 57, in respect of such Bill has not been withdrawn as provided for by the preceding resolutions, a certificate of that fact from the proper officer of the Court in which such money was deposited shall accompany such declaration, and such Bill shall not be referred to the Examiners.

That such Bill, indorsed by one of the Clerks in the Private Bill Office as having been duly deposited with such declaration and such certificate, if any, annexed, be laid by one of the Clerks of that Office upon the Table of the House in the next session of Parliament.

That such Bill, so laid upon the Table, shall be deemed to have been read a first time.

That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to such Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present session.

That all petitions presented in the present session against such Bill shall stand referred to the Committee on the Bill in the next session of Parliament, and that all notices and grounds of objections to the right of petitioners to be heard, given in the present session within the time prescribed by the Rules of the Referees relating to such notices, shall be held applicable in the next session of Parliament.

That no petitioners shall be heard before the Committee on such Bill unless their petition shall have been presented within the time limited in the present session, or in respect of which Standing Order No. 128 has been dispensed with in the present session, or unless their Petition shall be presented on or before the 12th day of February, 1907.

Ordered, That this Order be a Standing Order of the House 158

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]—Amendments reported (according to Order); and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow 160

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION —Petitions in favour of denominational religious teaching in schools, of parents and guardians of children attending schools at Patricroft; Ashton-under-Lyne; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 160

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WORCESTER ELECTION.—The Lord Steward to attend His Majesty with the Address on the part of this House in the place of the Lord Chamberlain 160

BOARD OF EDUCATION —List of boroughs and urban districts in England and Wales with a population of five thousand and upwards in which there are no council schools 161

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3663 Turkey (Baghdad)
Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LUNACY.—Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the numbers of patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ended 30th June, 1906 161

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury minutes, dated 28th June, 1906—Declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Keeper of the National Gallery of British Art at Millbank professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the public service are required; declaring that Leonardo de Santo, foreman, His Majesty's Office of Works, Constantinople, was appointed without a Civil Service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department .. 161

FINES, ETC. (IRELAND).—Abstract of Account of Fines accounted for by the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks, for the year 1904 161

DOGS REGULATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1865.—Accounts of receipts and expenditure under the Act, for the year 1905 161

COMPANIES (WINDING UP).—Fifteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under Section 29 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890 161

LAND REGISTRY.—Account of receipts and payments in respect of the land registry, for the year ended 31st March, 1906 161

July 5.]

Page

Post Office (Money Orders, Inland).—The Postal Order (Inland) Amendment (No. 1) Regulations, 1906, dated 22nd June, 1906 161

High Court of Justice and Court of Appeal, etc.—Account prepared in pursuance of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875, showing the receipts and expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal during the year ended the 31st March, 1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 162

Public Accounts.—Message from the Commons for leave for the Clerk of the Parliaments to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of that House: Leave given accordingly, and a message ordered to be sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith 162

Alkali, etc, Works Bill.—House in Committee (according to order).
Bill reported without Amendment and recommitted to the Standing Committee 162

Conveyancing Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of Onslow in the Chair.]

Lord Davey 162

Moved, "That the Amendments proposed by the Select Committee be made."—(*Lord Davey*).

On question, Motion agreed to.

Lord Davey 162

Moved, "That the Standing Committee be negatived."—(*Lord Davey.*)

On question, Motion agreed to.

The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow

Settled Land Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to Order).

Lord Davey 163

Moved, "That the Amendments proposed by the Select Committee be made."—(*Lord Davey.*)

On question, Motion agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

Married Women's Property Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to Order).

Lord Davey 163

Moved, "That the Amendments proposed by the Select Committee be made."—(*Lord Davey.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

THE MANNING OF THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

Lord Brassey 163
The Earl of Granard 168
Lord Muskerry 170
Lord Ellenborough 172

THE BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 172
The Lord Privy Seal (The Marquess of Ripon) 179
Viscount Sidmouth 183
Lord Newton 183
Lord Burghclere 185
Viscount Goschen 187
The Earl of Camperdown 189
Lord Heneage 190
The Marquess of Salisbury 191
The Lord President of the Council (The Earl of Crewe) 194

The House adjourned at half-past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, JULY 5TH, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 197

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 197

London and North Western Railway Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 197

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 198

July 5.]

Page

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [Lords]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [Lords]; Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords]; Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 198

Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [Lords].—Reported with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 198

Dover Corporation Bill [Lords].—Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time 198

Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 198

Railway Bills (Group 7).—Mr. Osmond Williams reported from the Committee on Group 7 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 198

PETITIONS.

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petitions against: from Barnet (two); Grosmont; Leiston cum Sizewell; Monken Hadley; and Ugley; to lie upon the Table 198

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petition from Wakefield, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 198

Education (England and Wales) Bill (Religious Teaching).—Petitions against alteration of Law; from Brinsley; Caddington; Hucknall under Huthwaite; Sutton in Ashfield; and South Croydon; to lie upon the Table 199

Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Glasgow (two), in favour; to lie upon the Table 199

Land Values Taxation, Etc. (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Eaglesham, against; to lie upon the Table 199

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill [Lords].—Petitions for alteration; from Blaydon on Tyne; Chester le Street; Dover; and Everton; to lie upon the Table 199

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Purchase Inspectors (Ireland).—Return [presented 3rd July] to be printed. [No. 237.] 199

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Copy presented, of Note explaining the Repeal Schedule [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 199

LAND REGISTRY.—Account presented of receipts and payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended March 31st, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 238.] 199

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE AND COURT OF APPEAL, ETC.—Copy presented of Account showing the Receipts and Expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal during the year ended March 31st, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 239.] .. 199

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill, Metropolitan District Railway Bill, without Amendment.

Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill, Waterford Corporation and Bridge Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [Lords], Trent Navigation Company Bill [Lords], without Amendment 199

WORCESTER ELECTION.—That they acquaint this House that His Majesty has appointed To-morrow, at Three of the clock, to receive the Address of both Houses of Parliament on the Election for the city of Worcester, and that they have appointed the Lord Steward and the Gentleman-at-Arms to present the said Address on the part of their Lordships; and that they do desire this House to appoint a proportionate number of its members to present the said Address with their Lordships 200

Wireless Telegraphy Bill.—Lords' Amendment to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 297.] 200

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Birrell 200

MONEY ORDERS—SYSTEM OF PAYMENT.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 201

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 201

LIGHTING AND VENTILATING DEPARTMENT PENSION SYSTEM.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. McKenna 202

VIZAMGAM-MALIA LINE.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Morley 202

MINUTES OF INTERMEDIATE BOARD.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 203

RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT—SHIPPING CLAIMS.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 203

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896—ADVANCES.—Question, Mr. Thornton (Clapham); Answer, Mr. McKenna 204

July 5.] Page

District Railway.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 204

Education Bill—Position of Schools.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner; Answer, Mr. Birrell 205

Education Bill—Position of Teachers.—Question, Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London); Answer, Mr. Birrell 206

Parliamentary Registration (Ireland) Act, 1855.—Question, Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 206

Irish Railways Inquiry.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Bryce 207

Congested Districts Board and Baslickane Farm, County Kerry.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 208

Intermediate Board and House of Commons. — Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Bryce 208

Foyle and Bann Fisheries.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 209

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

9th Queen's Royal Lancers.—Questions, Sir W. Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney), Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answers, the Secretary for State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 209

Cairo Barracks.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch; Answer, Mr. Haldane 210

Chinese Coolies in South Africa—The Repatriation Proclamation.—Questions, Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby), Mr. Verney (Buckinghamshire, N.); Answers, the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 211

Indentured Chinese in the Transvaal. — Questions, Sir Carne Rasch, Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 212

Coolie Desertions.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 213

African Forests.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Churchill 213

The Disturbance in Natal.—Questions, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), Mr. W. Redmond (Clare, E.); Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.), Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 214

The Ceylon Pearl Fisheries.—Questions, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Mr. Swift MacNeill, Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 216

British Indians in East Africa.—Questions, Mr Rees, Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire); Answers, Mr. Churchill 217

July 5.] *Page*

RELIGIOUS SERVICES IN NATAL.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.), Mr. Belloc (Salford, S.), Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.), Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London); Answers, Mr. Churchill 218

PUBLIC MEETINGS IN EASTERN BENGAL.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, The Secretary of State for India, (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 220

SWADESHI MOVEMENT.—Questions, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.), Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answers, Mr. Morley 221

EXAMINATIONS IN INDIAN LANGUAGES.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley 222

EASTERN BENGAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley 222

PARTITION OF BENGAL.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 222

TIBET. — Questions, Earl Percy (Kensington, S.), Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr. Morley 223

H. J. PENSON—INDIAN REMOUNT DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Sears (Cheltenham); Answer, Mr. Morley 224

ABYSSINIAN RAILWAY.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 225

THE DENSHAWE AFFRAY.—Questions, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.), Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.), Mr. Paul (Northampton); Answers, Sir Edward Grey 226

LAW OF TRESPASS IN EGYPT.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 228

BRITISH FLEETS IN RUSSIAN PORTS.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 228

SLAVERY ON THE WEST COAST OF AFRICA.—Questions, Sir Gilbert Baker (Gravesend); Answers, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Runciman) 229

METROPOLITAN POLICE SUNDAY DUTY.—Question, Mr. Hart Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 230

PRIVATE BURYING GROUNDS.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Sloan, and Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 230

SWEATED INDUSTRIES.—Question, Mr. J. W. Taylor (Durham, Chester-le-Street); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 231

ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE.—Question, Mr. Paul (Northampton); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 232

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LONDON TRAFFIC REPORT.—Question, Sir W. Evans-Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 232

July 5.] *Page*

WOMEN AGITATORS.—Questions, Mr. Snowden (Blackburn); Mr. Keir Hardie; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 232

SALISBURY RAILWAY ACCIDENT—DRIVERS AND SCHEDULED TIME.—Questions, Mr. Wardle (Stockport); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George Carnarvon Boroughs) 233

BIRMINGHAM RAILWAY FATALITY.—Question, Mr. Wardle; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 234

SEAMEN'S WAGES.—Questions, Mr. L. Haslam (Monmouth Boroughs) and Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answers, Mr. Lloyd-George 234

"BANKING" TRAINS.—Question, Mr. Wardle; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. 235

FILIAL LIABILITIES.—Question, Mr. Essex (Gloucestershire, Cirencester); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 236

GLASGOW POST OFFICE REVISION.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 237

SCHOOL CURRICULUM.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 237

THE EDUCATION GRANT.—Question, Mr. W. Hope (Somersetshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Lough 238

WHITBURN BEACH.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire) .. 238

PAROCHIAL ASSESSMENTS.—Question, Mr. Sears; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 239

DOG TAX.—Questions, Mr. Sears; Answers, Mr. McKenna 239

TRIAL BY JURY.—Question, Mr. Eugene Wason (Clackmannan and Kinross); Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 240

ROYAL BOTANICAL GARDENS, KEW.—Questions, Mr. Chiozza Money; Answers, Sir Edward Strachey (Somerset, S.) 240

IMPORTATION OF CATTLE INTO ALDERNEY.—Question, Mr. Essex; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 241

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS' ESTATES LICENCES.—Questions, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle); Answers, Mr. Charles Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 241

CONVERSION OF EASTER ROSS FARMS INTO DEER FORESTS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 242

TIMOLIN EVICTED TENANT.—Questions, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answers, Mr. Bryce (The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Aberdeen, S.) 242

July 5.] *Page*

WICKLOW MAGISTRATES.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 243

KILFINANCE NATIONAL SCHOOL.—Questions, Mr. Lundon (Limerick E.), Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answers, Mr. Bryce 244

BRUFF EVICTED TENANT.—Questions, Mr. Lundon and Mr. John Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Mr. Bryce 244

FAIR RENT APPEALS.—Questions, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.), Mr. John Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Flavin; Answers, Mr. Bryce 244

CLONFIN (LONGFORD) ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Cullinan (Tipperary, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 247

CRANMAGH FARM, NORTH MAYO.—Question, Mr. Conor O'Kelly (Mayo, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 247

KING HARMAN ESTATE COUNTY LONGFORD.—Question, Mr. Cullinan; Answer, Mr. Bryce 248

ATHY POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Kilbride; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 248

ILLEGAL PRACTICES IN THE CHURCH.—Question, Mr. Byles; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 249

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL.—Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland), Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) and Mr. Keir Hardie; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 249

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill: Mr. Attorney-General and Mr. Lloyd-George; and had appointed in substitution: The Lord-Advocate and Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure: Mr. Nussey; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. William Henry Hope.

Reports to lie upon the Table 250

NEW WRIT.—Motion made, and Question—"That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Cornwall (South Eastern or Bodmin Division), in the room of the Honourable Thomas Charles Reginald Agar-Robartes, whose election has been declared to be void"—(*Mr. George Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to 253

July 5.] Page

SUPPLY [15TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906–7.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That a sum, not exceeding £40,396, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

Mr. H. H. Marks (*Kent, Thanet*) 253

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That Item A (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. H. H. Marks.*)

Sir Gilbert Parker (*Gravesend*) 258
Mr. McKean (*Monaghan, S.*) 266
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 282
The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick*) 286
Earl Percy (*Kensington, S.*) 289
Mr. Keir Hardie (*Merthyr Tydvil*) 298
Mr. Stuart Samuel (*Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel*) 300
Sir Edward Sassoon (*Hythe*) 301
Mr. Bennett (*Oxfordshire, Woodstock*) 306
Mr. Dillon (*Mayo, E.*) 310
Sir Edward Grey 315

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. J. M. Robertson (*Northumberland, Tyneside*) 330

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow ; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

WORCESTER ELECTION.—Message from the Lords [this day] relating to the Worcester Election read.

MESSAGE TO THE LORDS.—Resolved, That Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Causton, and the Comptroller of the Household be appointed to present to His Majesty the said Address, with the Lords, as mentioned in their Lordships' Message.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Whiteley.*) .. ..

Mr. Keir Hardie (*Merthyr Tydvil*) 330
Dr. Cooper (*Southwark, Bermondsey*) 331
Mr. C. Duncan (*Barrow-in-Furness*) 332
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.*) 332
Mr. Cremer (*Shoreditch, Haggerston*) 332

And, it being half-past Eleven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at half-past Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 6th JULY, 1903.

WORCESTER ELECTION.—Message from the Commons that they have appointed Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Causton, and the Comptroller of the Household to go with the Lords mentioned in their Lordships' message to wait upon His Majesty with the Address relative to the election for the city of Worcester 333

EARLDOM OF NORFOLK.—Committee for Privileges met: Counsel further heard on behalf of the Duke of Norfolk: Committee adjourned to Monday next 333

WORCESTER ELECTION.—The King's answer to the Address reported by the Lord Steward (*E. Liverpool*), as follows:

"I have received the Joint Address of the two Houses of Parliament in reference to the Report made by the judges selected to try a Petition in respect of the Election and Return for the city of Worcester; and I have given directions accordingly for the appointments of the Gentlemen named in the Address to be Commissioners for the purpose of making the inquiry prayed for." 333

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3); Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8).

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill: Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Great Northern Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 333

Bury Corporation Bill [H.L.]—Commons Amendments considered and agreed to 334

July 6.] *Page*

Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 334

South Suburban Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, and passed 334

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 334

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 334

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill—Brought from the Commons 334

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners .. 334

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—Read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 153.) 334

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 334

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890.—Order in Council, dated June 30th, 1906, entitled "The East Africa and Uganda (Currency) Order in Council, 1906," amending the East Africa and Uganda (Currency) Order in Council, 1905. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 334

University of London Act, 1898 (University College, London (Transfer) Act, 1905).

Statutes made by the Senate of the University of London, in pursuance of the University College, London (Transfer) Act, 1905, for the management of the University College, London, and Amendments to existing statutes in connection therewith.

Statutes made by the University College Transfer Commissioners for regulating the constitution and management of (*a*) University College School, Hampstead; (*b*) the North London or University College Hospital, and the school of advanced medical studies connected therewith; and orders made by the Commissioners supplemental to the above statutes.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 152). .. 335

Light Railways Act, 1896.

I. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of—

Light railways in the parish and urban district of Woking and in the parishes of Chobham, Horsell, and Windlesham, in the rural district of Chertsey, all in the county of Surrey.

July 6.] *Page*

Light railways in the urban district of Stretford, in the county palatine of Lancaster.

Additional light railways in the parish of Davyhulme, in the rural district of Barton-upon-Irwell, and in the parish and urban district of Stretford, in the county of Lancaster.

II. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade.

Reviving the powers granted and extending the period limited by the Canterbury and Herne Bay Light Railway Order, 1903, for the compulsory purchase of lands and extending the period limited by that Order for the completion of the railway works by that Order authorised.

Authorising the construction of a light railway in the county of Kent from Headcorne to Maidstone.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 335

TIDWORTH BARRACKS.

Earl Bathurst 336
The Under-Secretary of State for War (The Earl of Portsmouth) .. 337
The Lord Bishop of Winchester 338
The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury 339

CHINESE ON THE RAND.

The Lord Bishop of Hereford 339
The Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Elgin) 344
The Marquess of Lansdowne 347
The Lord Privy Seal (The Marquess of Ripon) 348
Lord Stanmore 349

Conveyancing Bill [H.L.]; Settled Land Bill [H.L.]; Married Women's Property Bill [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bill to be read 3ª on Tuesday next.

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 6TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Metropolitan Railway Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 350

July 6.] *Page*

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways Bill [Lords]; Manchester Churches Bill [Lords]; Newtownards Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 350

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill.—Not amended, considered 351

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill according read the third time, and passed 351

Kent Electric Power Bill [Lords].—To be read a second time upon Monday next 351

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—As amended, considered. Read the third time, and passed 351

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments. Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. 351

Private Bills (Group H).—Mr. Mooney reported from the Committee on Group H of Private Bills. That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 351

Message from the Lords.

That they have agreed to: Midland Railway Bill; Uxbridge Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to: Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway Bill [Lords]; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill [Lords]; Clacton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Newport Harbour Commissioners Bill [TLords]; Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund) Bill [Lords]; Sheffield District Railway Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Altrincham Urban District Council Tramways, Dewsbury Corporation Tramways, Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Tramways, Ossett Corporation Tramways, Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Port Seton Extension) and Rochdale Corporation Tramways." [Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Aylesbury, Boston, Castle Ward, Weetslade and Cramlington, Godalming (Extension), Gomersal, Henley-on-Thames, Pinner, Stanmore, Harrow Weald, and Edgware, Ryton, Swanage, and Wantage and District." [Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].]

July 6.] *Page*

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.—That they give leave to the Clerk of the Parliaments to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of this House on Public Accounts 351

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 301.] 352

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [LORDS]. — Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 302.] 352

PETITIONS.

BETTING AND GAMBLING.—Petition from Dundee, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 352

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against; From Aldenham; Beckford (three); Creditor; North Curry; and St. Hilary; to lie upon the table 352

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS) TEACHING.—Two Petitions from Llangynidir, against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table .. 352

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.—Petition from Wycombe, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 352

LAND VALUES TAXATION, ETC. (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against; From Langside and Townhead; to lie upon the Table 353

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petition from London, in favour; to lie upon the Table 353

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON ACT, 1898, AND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON (TRANSFER) ACT, 1905.—Copy presented of Statutes made by the Senate of the University of London, in pursuance of the University College, London (Transfer), Act, 1905, for the management of the University College, London, and Amendments to existing Statutes in connection therewith [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 241.] 353

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copy presented of Order in Council, dated June 30th, 1906, entitled "The East Africa and Uganda (Currency) Order in Council, 1906," amending the East Africa and Uganda (Currency) Order in Council, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 353

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, revising the powers granted and extending the period limited by the Canterbury and Herne Bay Light Railway Order, 1903, for the compulsory purchase of lands and extending the period limited by that Order for the completion of the railway and works by that Order authorised [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 353

July 6.] *Page*

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Kent, from Headcorn to Maidstone [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 353

Light Railways Act, 1896. — Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the urban district of Stretford, in the County Palatine of Lancaster [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 354

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of additional Light Railways in the parish of Daveyhulme, in the rural district of Barton-upon-Irwell, and in the parish and urban district of Stretford, in the county of Lancaster [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 354

Light Railways Act, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the parish and urban district of Woking, and in the parishes of Chobham, Horsell, and Windlesham in the rural district of Chertsey, all in the county of Surrey [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 354

University College London (Transfer), Act, 1905.—Copy presented, of Statutes made by the University Transfer Commissions for regulating the Constitution and Management of (*a*) University College School, Hampstead, (*b*) the North London or University College Hospital and the School of Advanced Medical Studies connected therewith, and Orders made by the Commissioners supplemental to the above Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 240.] 354

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Telegraph Boys doing Sorters' Work at Carlisle.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 355

Classification of Sub-Postmasters.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 355

Wages of Athea and Knockdown Rural Postmen.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 355

Revenue Bill—Industrial Alcohol.—Question, Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, Mr. Asquith.. 355

Education Bill—Position of Transferred Voluntary Schools.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Birrell 356

Certified Efficient Schools and Religious Instruction.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Birrell 357

Teachers and Religious Instruction.—Questions, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answers, Mr. Birrell 357

July 6.] Page

Retirement of Clerks to Surveyors of Taxes.—Question, Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs); Answer, Mr. McKenna 357

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Thomas Dooner.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 358

Bann Drainage Scheme.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 358

Result of the Abbeyleix Police Inquiry.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Bryce 359

Building Grants for Irish National Schools.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Bryce 359

NEW WRIT.

Colonel Saunderson (Armagh, N.) 359

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland to make out a new writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the county of Tyrone (East Tyrone) in the room of Patrick Charles Doogan, esquire, deceased."—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 362
Mr. Dodd (Tyrone, N.) 364

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned till Thursday next."—(*Mr. John Redmond.*)

Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 367
Captain Craig (Down, E.) 368

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate adjourned accordingly.

Yarmouth Election Petition.

Mr. Swift Macneill (Donegal, S.) 369
Sir G. Kekewich (Exeter) 376

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the Report of the proceedings on the trial of the Election Petition for Yarmouth, and the complaints that have been made of the partisan and political character of the conduct during the trial of that Petition of Mr. Justice Grantham." —(*Mr. Swift MacNeill.*)

Mr. Buckmaster (Cambridge) 378
Mr. A. Dewar (Edinburgh, S.) 387
The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 391
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 402
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 408

July 6.] *Page*

Mr. Everett, (Suffolk Woodbridge) 412
Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire) 412
Mr. Blake (Longford, S.) 413

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [18th May], " That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—(*Mr. McKillop.*)

Amendment—

" To leave out the word ' Law,' and insert the word ' Trade,'—(*Mr. John Redmond*)— instead thereof "—

Put, and agreed to.

Main Question, as amended, proposed.

Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) 414
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 415
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 415
The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. 417
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University) 418
Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London) 420

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. J. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put."

Question put, " That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 255 ; Noes, 66. (Division List, No. 192).

Main Question, as amended, put accordingly, and agreed to. Bill committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 423

NEW BILLS.

Church Discipline.—Bill to make further provision for enforcing discipline in the Church of England, ordered to be brought in by Sir David Brynmor Jones, Mr. Channing, Sir George Kekewich, and Mr. Mallet.

" Bill to make further provision for enforcing discipline in the Church of England," presented, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Friday, July 20th, and to be printed. [Bill 298.] 423

Cruelty to Animals (No. 2) Bill.—Bill to amend the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, ordered to be brought in by Sir Frederick Banbury and Colonel Lockwood.

" Bill to amend the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876," presented, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Friday, November 16th, and to be printed. [Bill 299.] 423

Dogs Protection (No. 2) Bill.—Bill to prohibit experiments on dogs, ordered to be brought in by Sir Frederick Banbury and Colonel Lockwood.

"Bill to prohibit experiments on dogs," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, November 9th, and to be printed. [Bill 300.] 423

Selection (Standing Committees).—Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, in respect of the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill: Mr. Ellis Griffith; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Essex.

Report to lie upon the Table 423

Whereupon Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 3, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at sixteen minutes after five o'Clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 9TH JULY, 1906.

Earldom of Norfolk.—Committee for Privileges met: A witness examined. Council further heard on behalf of the Duke of Norfolk: Council heard in reply on behalf of the claimant, Lord Mowbray: Committee adjourned to Thursday next 425

The Lord Kenlis (*M. Headfort*), took the Oath 425

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation; Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment).

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 425

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill.—Committee (which stands appointed for To-morrow) put off *sine die*. 425

Dover Harbour (Works, &c.) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons 425

London and South Western Railway Bill.—Manchester Corporation Bill; Cheltenham Gas Bill; Metropolitan Water Board Bill; Peterborough Gas Bill; North East London Railway Bill; Huddersfield Corporation Bill; Cardiff Gas Bill; London County Buildings Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 425

South Lincolnshire Water Bill.—Brought from the Commons, Read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners 425

July 9.]

Page

Newtownards Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 426

Manchester Churches Bill [H.L.]; Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 426

Metropolitan Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons, with the Amendents agreed to 426

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. Moved, That the order made on March 26th last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after June 19th next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to. Bills read 2ª accordingly .. 426

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill—Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 426

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. Committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow .. 426

London County Council (Money) Bill.—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª." (Lord *Welby.*)

Earl of Camperdown 426
Lord Welby 438
Lord Avebury 447
Lord Montagu of Beaulieu 450
Lord Ludlow 451
Viscount Goschen 452
Lord Monkswell 454
Earl of Donoughmore 456
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (Earl of Carrington) 460
Lord Stanley of Alderley 463
The Marquess of Lansdowne 463
The Lord Privy Seal (The Marquess of Ripon) 468

On Question, Bill read 2ª and committed.

PETITIONS.

Sunday Closing of Shops, etc.—Petition in favour of legislation of nine meetings in diocese of Carlisle; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 470

Page

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.—Report from the Committee of Selection that the following Lords be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act, viz., V. Hill, L. Torphichen; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly .. 470

TREATY SERIES, No. 8 (1906).—Accession of Columbia to the Convention signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded in armies in the field. (June 7th, 1906) 470

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS, 1905).—Report on the Agricultural Returns relating to acreage and produce of crops and number of live stock in Great Britain, with Summaries for the United Kingdom, British Possessions, and foreign countries, and particulars of prices, imports, and exports of agricultural produce.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table 470

GAS AND WATER WORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.—Reports by the Board of Trade as to the grounds on which they have dispensed (1) with the consents of certain local and road authorities in the case of the Mid-Kent Water Provisional Order; (2) with the consent of the Chippenham Rural District Council in the case of the Corsham Gas Provisional Order 471

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury Minute, dated July 3rd, 1906, declaring Chinanfu to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1876.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 471

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.—University Court Ordinance, No. XVI. (Glasgow, No. 4), Institution of a degree in science in pharmacy: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 154.) 471

Juvenile Smoking Bill [H.L.]—Report from the Select Committee, That it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 471

JUVENILE SMOKING.—Report from the Select Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee), made, and to be printed. (No. 155.) Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out .. 471

RESERVE OFFICERS.

Lord Rosmead 471
The Under-Secretary of State for War (The Earl of Portsmouth) .. 472

EXPERIMENTAL MOBILISATION.

The Earl of Wemyss 473
The Earl of Portsmouth 474

Soldiers' Married Quarters.

The Earl of Dartmouth 476
The Earl of Portsmouth 476

House adjourned at half-past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, at quarter-past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MONDAY, 9TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dowlais Gas Bill; Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill; Waterford Corporation and Bridge Bill.—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 478

Dover Corporation Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 478

London and North Western Railway Bill [Lords] (King's Consent Signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 478

South Lincolnshire Water Bill.—As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 478

Sutton District Water Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 478

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 478

Kent Electric Power Bill [Lords] (by Order).—Read a second time and committed 478

Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill.—Read a second time and committed 479

Private Bills (Group I).—Mr. Toulmin reported from the Committee on Group I of Provisional Orders Confirmation Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had further adjourned till Thursday, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 479

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to: South Suburban Gas Bill, without Amendment.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to: Bury Corporation Bill [Lords]; Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

July 9.] *Page*

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the construction of certain new works for improving the harbour of Dover; the abandonment of certain authorised works by the Dover Harbour Board and for other purposes." [Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill [Lords] .. 479

Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time, and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 479

PETITIONS.

Census of Production Bill.—Petition from Huddersfield, against; to lie upon the Table 479

Education (England and Wales) Bill.—Petitions against. From Long Framlington; Nottingham; and, Plumtree; to lie upon the Table 479

Education (England and Wales) Bill (Religious Teaching).—Petition from Gravelly, against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 479

Poisons and Pharmacy Bill [Lords].—Petition from East Dorset, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 479

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance).—Copy presented, of University Court Ordinance, No. XVI. (Glasgow, No. 4) (Institution of a Degree in Science in Pharmacy) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 242] 480

Army (Civil Employment).—Copy presented, of Report of the Committee on Civil Employment of ex soldiers and sailors, with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 480

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (Agricultural Returns).—Copy presented, of Report on the Agricultural Returns for Great Britain, with Statistics for the United Kingdom, British Possessions, and Foreign Countries for 1905 [by Command], to lie upon the Table 480

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Copy presented, of Annual Report of Proceedings under the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts, &c., for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 480

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Copy presented, of Report of the Proceedings at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of Repesentatives of Authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888, June 14th, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 480

Superannuation Acts, 1859 and 1876.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated July 3rd, 1906, declaring Chinanfu to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1876 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 480

Gas and Waterworks Facilities Act, 1870.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with consents of certain Local and Road Authorities in the case of the Mid Kent Water Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed [No. 243] 480

July 9.] *Page*

GAS AND WATERWORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with the consent of the Chippenham Rural District Council in the case of the Corsham Gas Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 244] 481

TREATY SERIES (No. 8) 1906.—Copy presented, of Accession of Columbia to the Convention, signed at Geneva, August 22nd, 1864, for the Amelioration of the condition of the wounded in Armies in the Field, June 7th, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 481

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS) — Address for "Returns from every County Court in England and Wales of the total number of Plaints, &c., entered in each Court from the 1st day of January to the 31st day of December, 1905, both days inclusive, distinguishing those not exceeding £20, those above £20 and not exceeding £50, those above £50 and not exceeding £100, and those by agreement over £100."

"And, of the Sittings of the County Courts in England and Wales holden before the Judges of such Courts in the year 1905 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No 284, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel*) 481

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

H.M.S. "AFRICA."—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 481

DESPATCHES OF MAILS FROM SLIDDERY, ISLE OF ARRAN.—Question, Mr. Lamout (Buteshire); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 482

TRANSVAAL SELF-GOVERNMENT.—Question, Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 482

MERCHANT VESSELS AND THE NAVAL MANŒUVRES.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 482

ERECTION OF LETTER BOX AT CLEGGAN.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 483

MINTON (BOURNEMOUTH) POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch), Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 483

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF THOMAS FLANAGAN.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory), Answer, Mr. Bryce 483

CASE OF PAT FAHY.—Question, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 484

RESTORATION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE LATE MRS. SEXTON.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 484

EVICTED TENANTS IN COUNTY KILKENNY.—Question, Mr. Meagher; Answer, Mr. Bryce 485

HOLDING FOR CALDBECK ON THE WARING ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Meagher; Answer, Mr. Bryce 485

MARINE WORKS IN COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Mr. Conor O'Kelly (Mayo, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 486

SALE OF THE PERRY-KNOX-GORE ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Conor O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. Bryce 476

MEAT CONTRACTS FOR TROOPS AT BELFAST.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Haldane 487

PIGEON SHOOTING IN EGYPT.—Question, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 487

ARTILLERY PRACTICE ON DARTMOOR.—Question, Mr. Luttrell (Devonshire, Tavistock); Answer, Mr. Haldane 488

FURNISHING OF OFFICERS' QUARTERS—LOCAL TENDERS.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Haldane 488

AUSTRALIAN TINNED MEAT.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 488

SOUTH AFRICAN CUSTOMS DUTY ON SKIMMED CONDENSED MILK.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Churchill 490

THE RAJAH OF SARAWAK AND THE SULTAN OF BRUNEI AND THE FOREIGN OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. 490

TEMPORARY SECOND DIVISION CLERKS APPOINTED TO IRISH GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. McKenna 491

EXCISE DEPARTMENT—PROMOTION TO SUPERVISORSHIPS.—Question, Mr. Snowden (Blackburn); Answer, Mr. McKenna 491

INSPECTION OF IMPORTED FOOD.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. John Burns 492

RAILWAY RATES AND FACILITIES.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 492

DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTS UNDER THE EDUCATION BILL.—Question, Mr. Courtenay Warner (Staffordshire, Lichfield); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 493

SCHOOLS PROMOTED BY PERSONS OTHER THAN LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Walrond (Devonshire, Tiverton); Answer, Mr. Birrell 494

MEN EMPLOYED IN ROYAL DOCKYARDS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 495

APPLICATION FOR ALLOTMENTS AT ACHSCRABSTER—(EXPENSE INVOLVED.).—Question, Mr. R. L. Harmsworth (Caithness-shire); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 495

PAYMENTS UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL RATES ACT.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. John Burns 496

ASSESSMENT AND TAXATION OF COAL.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie; Answer, Mr. John Burns 496

AMERICAN BEEF COMPANIES AND INCOME BILL.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Asquith 496

July 9.] *Page*

Great Southern and Western Railway and Carriage of Exhibits from Agricultural Shows.—Question, Mr. Field ?—Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 497

Irish Agricultural Organisation Association.—Question, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 498

Construction of a Boat Slip at Maghery Bay.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 499

Bank of Engiand Stock.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 499

Extension of Labourers (Ireland) Act to Artisans of Urban Districts.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway); Answer, Mr. Bryce 500

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

British Naval Training.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) .. 500

Army Route Marching.—Question, Mr. Leif Jones (Westmeath); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 500

Bloemfontein Garrison.—Question, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, N.E., Barkston Ash); Answer, Mr. Haldane 501

Reservists in the Brigade of Guards.—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon); Answer, Mr. Haldane 502

Cost of a Grenadier Guard.—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answer, Mr. Haldane 502

Cost of a Battalion of the Guards.—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answer, Mr. Haldane 502

Cost of Army Maintenance.—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answer, Mr. Haldane 503

Winter Training of Militia Regiments.—Question, Mr. Hicks-Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, Mr. Haldane 504

Australian Mail Service.—Questions, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 505

General Botha and the Chinese Coolies.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 505

White Labour in the Transvaal Mines.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Mr. Churchill 505

Kaffirs in the Transvaal Mines.—Questions, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs), Mr. Paul (Northampton); Answers, Mr. Churchill 506

Outrages by Chinese Coolies.—Questions, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham), Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend), Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answers, Mr. Churchill 507

July 9.] *Page*

South African Labour Party and Coolie Repatriation.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, Mr. Churchill 507

Murder by Natives in Natal.—Questions, Mr. Rees and Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 508

The Swadeshi Movement in Bengal.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 508

Outrages by Indian Natives.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 509

Indian Official Publications.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Morley 509

Indian Viceregal Council and the Budget Debate.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Morley 510

British Garrison in Egypt.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury, for Sir Edward Grey) 510

Dalny.—Question, Mr. Straus (Tower Hamlets, Mile End); Answer, Mr. Runciman 510

Macedonia Administration.—Question, Mr. Gooch (Bath); Answer, Mr. Runciman 510

Turkish Reforms.—Question, Mr. Leif Jones; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 511

Macedonian Gendarmerie.—Question, Mr. Leif Jones; Answer, Mr. Runciman 511

Khanikin—Kermanshah Railway Project.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Runciman 511

Turco-Persian Boundary Commission.—Question, Sir W. Evans Gordon; Answer, Mr. Runciman 512

Russia and the Aland Islands.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach; Answer, Mr. Runciman 512

Visit of the British Fleet to Russian Ports.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach; Answer, Mr. Runciman 512

Ethiopian Railway.—Question, Mr. Hicks Beach; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 513

Workmen's Compensation—Southwark Case. — Questions, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 513

Danger of Tram Ticket Collections—Hammersmith Fatality.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 514

Case of Mrs. Ellen Hitchcock. — Question, Mr. Radford (Islington, E.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 514

July 9.]

Page

Case of Edward Guerin.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 515

Vaccination Exemption Certificates.—Questions, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford), Mr. Brace (Glamorganshire, S.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 515

Committal for Contempt of Court—Case of Mrs. Hunt of Exmouth.—Question, Sir G. Kekewich (Exeter); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 516

Prosecution of a Cab Driver at Marlborough Street Police Court.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 517

German Railway Statistics.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 517

British Railway Statistics.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 518

Workmen's Trains.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 518

Armagh Boiler Explosion.—Question, Mr. Hudson (Newcastle-on-Tyne); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 519

Metropolitan Asylums Board Hospital Regulations.—Question, Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire); Answer, the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 519

Notification of Infectious Outbreaks.—Questions, Mr. Straus and Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answers, Mr. John Burns .. 520

Motor Car Fatalities.—Questions, Mr. G. H. Faber (Boston), Mr. Cathcart son (Orkney and Shetland); Answers, Mr. John Burns 521

Vaccination Fees.—Question, Mr. Hudson; Answer, Mr. John Burns .. 522

Instruction in Agriculture.—Question, Colonel Harrison-Broadley (Yorkshire, E.R., Howdenshire); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 523

Medical Inspection of School Children.—Questions, Mr. Alden and Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 523

Teachers' Superannuation.—Question, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 524

Llanelian School Teacher.—Question, Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton); Answer, Mr. Birrell 524

State Aided School Grants.—Questions, Mr. J. F. Mason (Windsor), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answers, Mr. Birrell 525

Teachers and Religious Instruction.—Question, Mr. J. F. Mason (Windsor); Answer, Mr. Birrell 525

Part III. of the Education Bill.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Mr. Birrell 525

July 9.] *Page*

"EXTENDED FACILITIES" ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answers, Mr. Birrell 526

TEACHERS' UNDERTAKINGS.—Questions, Mr. Lane-Fox; Answers, Mr. Birrell 526

REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON LONDON TRAFFIC.—Questions, Mr. Menzies (Lanarkshire, S.) and Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answers, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 257

FATAL ACCIDENTS (SCOTLAND BILL).—Question, Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs); Answer, Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 528

CEYLON PEARL FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. J. Henderson (Aberdeenshire, W.); Answer, the Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 529

SCOTTISH SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 529

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 529

ARMY SUPPLY.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 530

ULSTER SERMON AT BELFAST.—Questions, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.), Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.), Lord Turnour (Sussex, Horsham), and Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange) 530

KINVARD HARBOUR.—Questions, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.), Mr. Sloan, and Mr. William Redmond; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 531

GLENDBOY EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 533

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.), Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Sloan; Answers, Mr. Bryce 534

IRELAND AND THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON CANALS.—Question, Mr. John Redmond; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 534

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS—Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this session of Parliament relating to the Revenues of India be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the Whole House.—(*Mr. Secretary Morley.*)

Resolved, That this House will, upon Friday, July 20th, resolve itself into the said Committee.—(*Mr. Secretary Morley*) 534

Reserve Forces Bill.—Lords' Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to.—(*Mr. Secretary Haldane*) 534

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the

July 9.] Page

following Member from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, in respect of the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill: Dr. Macnamara; and had appointed in substitution, Major Renton 534

Report to lie upon the Table.

BUTTER TRADE.—Report from the Select Committee with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 245] 534

NEW BILL.

Irish Tobacco Bill.—"To repeal the Law which prohibits the growing of Tobacco in Ireland," presented by Mr. William Redmond; supported by Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, and Mr. Charles Devlin; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 303] 534

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

On Clause 8:—

Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 535

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 19, to leave out the words 'sufficient guarantee is given,' and insert the words 'they are satisfied that sufficient provision will be made.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'sufficient' stand part of the clause."

The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. 536

Sir E. Carson (Dublin University) 536
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) 537
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 537
Mr. Birrell 537

Amendment negatived.

Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 538

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 19, to leave out from the word 'sufficient,' to the word 'and,' in line 21, and insert the words 'evidence is furnished that such a proposal is in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the parents of children attending the school.'"—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Question proposed, "That the words to the word 'for' in page 5, line 21, stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 539
Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 540
Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 540
Sir E. Carson 541
Mr. Birrell 541

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 236 ; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 193.)

Mr. Middlemore (*Birmingham, N.*) 545

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 21, to leave out the words 'five years' and insert the words 'one year.'"—(*Mr. Middlemore.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'five years' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 545
Sir William Anson 546
Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) 547
Sir E. Carson 548
Mr. Samuel Roberts (*Sheffield, Ecclesall*) 548
Mr. Birrell 548
Mr. A. J. Balfour 549
Mr. Bridgeman (*Shropshire, Oswestry*) 550

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 252 ; Noes, 131. (Division List No. 194.)

Mr. Middlemore 553

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 24, to leave out from the word 'is' to the word 'they,' in line 25, and to insert the word 'advisable.'"—(*Mr. Middlemore.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause" put, and agreed to.

Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 554

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 25, to leave out the word 'best,' and to insert the word 'only.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

July 9.]

Page

Mr. Birrell 555
Sir William Anson 555
Sir E. Carson 556

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir William Anson 557

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 26, after the word 'scheme' to insert the words 'require the local education authority to comply with such conditions as to payment or otherwise not being inconsistent with this Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 558

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, to leave out line 28, and the first word in line 29."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Sir E. Carson 560
Mr. Perks (*Lincolnshire, Louth*) 561
Mr. R. Pearce (*Staffordshire, Leek*) 562
Mr. Leif Jones (*Westmoreland, Appleby*) 562
Mr. Birrell 563

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr. Cave 563

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 31, to leave out the words 'or repair,' and to insert the words 'enlargement or improvement.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 564
Mr. Perks 564
Mr. Birrell 565
Mr. Leif Jones 565

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"At end to add 'or fitting up.'"—(*Mr. Leif Jones.*)

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and agreed to.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 565

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 32, after the word 'schoolhouse,' to insert the words 'and the dates at which such grants or assistance were received.'"—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Solicitor-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) 567
Lord Balcarres 567
Lord R. Cecil 567

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 152; Noes, 304. (Division List No. 195.)

Lord Balcarres 571

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 32, after the word 'schoolhouse,' to insert the words, 'and the contributions of the supporters of the school to the maintenance and repair of the schoolhouse and the saving effected of public funds, as regards salaries of officials and expenses of administration by the voluntary services of school correspondents and other supporters of the schools.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir W. Robson 573
Mr. A. J. Balfour 573
Lord R. Cecil 574

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 151; Noes, 310. (Division List No. 196.)

Mr. Ashley (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 579

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 33, to leave out sub-paragraph (ii)"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'the' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 580
Mr. A. J. Balfour 581

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 319 ; Noes, 149. (Division List No. 197.)

Mr. Laurence Hardy 585

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 33, to leave out the word 'limited.'"—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'limited' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 587
Lord R. Cecil 587
Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 587

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lane Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkeston Ash) 587

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 35, to leave out sub-paragraph (iii)."—(*Mr. Lane-Fox.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'the' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 588
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 589
Sir E. Carson 589
Mr. Perks 589
Mr. Birrell 590
Mr. Laurence Hardy 591
Mr. Butcher (Cambridge University) 591
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 592
Mr. Birrell 593
Mr. Leif Jones 593
Sir E. Carson 594
Lord R. Cecil 594
Mr. R. Pearce 596
Lord Balcarres 596
Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 597
Sir Philip Magnus (London University) 597
Mr. Carlile 598

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 256 ; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 198.)

Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 601
Mr. Birrell 603
Mr. Blake (Longford, S.) 603
Sir William Anson 603

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes 47 ; Noes 298. (Division List No. 199.)

Mr. Bridgeman 607

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 40, after the word 'considered,' to insert the words 'provided that, if required by the owners of the schoolhouse, any such scheme shall provide for affording facilities for religious instruction of a special character under Section 3 of this Act, and in cases satisfying the conditions of Section 4 for affording facilities under that section.'"—(*Mr. Bridgeman.*)

Mr. Birrell 607
Sir William Anson 608
Mr. Cave (*Surrey, Kingston*) 608
Lord Balcarres 609
Mr. Herbert (*Buckinghamshire, Wycombe*) 609

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Balcarres 610

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 40, after the word 'considered' to add the words provided that in no case shall the rent fixed by a scheme be less than the amount which will be produced by a charge of 5s. per head on average attendance.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (*Mr. Lough, Islington, W.*) 611
Lord Balcarres 611
Sir Frederick Banbury (*City of London*) 611
Sir William Anson 612
Sir W. Robson 612

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Cave 613

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 1, after the word 'Commission' to insert the words 'shall be subject to the like conditions as to publication and approval by His Majesty in Council as a scheme made by the Board of Education under the Endowed Schools Act, but subject thereto.'" —(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir W. Robson 614
Mr. Bridgeman 614
Mr. Herbert 615
Sir Frederick Banbury 615
Sir William Anson 616
Mr. Evelyn Cecil 617
Mr. Perks 618

Question put.

July 9.]

Page

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 116 ; Noes, 286. (Divisional List No. 200.)

Mr. Evelyn Cecil 621

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 1, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'be laid upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament as soon as possible after the same has been made, and shall lie there for six weeks, and, unless within that period a Resolution shall be passed by either House rejecting the same.' "—(*Mr. Evelyn Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir W. Robson 623
Sir E. Carson 623
Mr. Lyttelton (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) 624
Sir W. Robson 624

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 135 ; Noes, 299. (Division List No. 201.)

Sir William Anson 627

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 2, at end, to insert the words 'but may from time to time be altered by order of the Board of Education on the application of the owners of the school or the local education authority, and with the consent of both.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. Birrell 629

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir Francis Powell 630

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 3, to leave out sub-section (4)."—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'and,' in line 5, stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 631
Mr. A. J. Balfour 631
Sir W. Robson 632
Mr. F. E. Smith (*Liverpool, Walton*) 633
Mr. Paul (*Northampton*) 634
Lord R. Cecil 634
Sir W. Robson 634
Sir E. Carson 634

July 9.] *Page*

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 315 ; Noes, 148. (Division List No. 202.)

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the business.

Whereupon, Mr. BIRRELL claimed, " That the Question, ' That the clause as amended stand part of the Bill,' be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 311 ; Noes, 145. (Division List No. 203.)

Question put accordingly, " That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 311 ; Noes, 146. (Division List No. 204.)

Whereupon the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again To-morrow.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.) 649

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the debate be now adjourned."

Sir E. Carson 649
Mr. Wolff (Belfast, E.) 650
Mr. John Redmond 651

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Wednesday.

Musical Copyright Bill.—Order for the House to be put into Committee read.

Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland) 651

NEW WRIT.—New Writ for the county of Tyrone (East Tyrone). Order (July 6th), for resuming, upon Thursday, the Adjourned Debate on the Motion relating to the New Writ for the county of Tyrone (East Tyrone), read, and discharged.—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

Motion withdrawn 652

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 1.

Adjourned at twelve minutes before Twelve o'clock.

July 10.] *Page*

HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 10TH JULY, 1906.

The LORD ORIEL (*V. Massereene*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 653

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Report from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.. 653

Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [H.L.].—The Duke of Norfolk (in his place) consented to the Bill 653

Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill; Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bills reported, with Amendments 653

London Squares and Enclosures Bill [H.L.]. (On re-commitment.) Reported with further Amendments 653

Rochester, Chatham and Strood Gas Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 653

Watford Gas Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill; Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments 653

North-West London Railway Bill.—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 21st and 25th of June last discharged, and Bill committed 653

London Government Schemes (London and Penge, etc.) Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House 653

Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [H.L.].—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill had been withdrawn. The Order made on Tuesday last discharged, and Bill committed for Thursday next 653

Great Northern Railway Bill.—Moved, That the Order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2; agreed to. Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 654

Dover Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to .. 654

London and North-Western Railway Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 654

Reserve Forces Bill; Dowlais Gas Bill; Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill; Waterford Corporation, and Bridge Bill.—Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to 654

July 10.] *Page*

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—House in Committee according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a on Thursday next 654

Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2^a (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3^a on Thursday next 654

PETITIONS.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL [H.L.].—Petition in favour of: of the Incorporated Company of Merchants of Edinburgh; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 654

EDUCATION.—Petitions in favour of denominational religious teaching in schools; of parents and guardians of children attending schools at Manchester, Cheetham Hill; of teachers in schools at Chadderton, Manchester.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table 654

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.].—Petition in favour of; of the Incorporated Company of Merchants of Edinburgh; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 655

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.—Report of Proceedings at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888. Thursday, 14th June, 1906. Annual Report of Proceedings under the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act, etc., etc., for the year 1905; Report of the progress of the ordnance survey, to the 31st March, 1906 655

COLONIES (ANNUAL).—No. 487. Wei-Hai-Wei (Report for 1905) 655

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3664. The Bahrain Islands.

No. 3665. United States (New York) 655

SPAIN (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF).—Translation of the New Customs Tariff of Spain, with comparison of the duties leviable under the tariff in force prior to the 1st July, 1906 655

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS.—Report on strikes and lock-outs and on conciliation and arbitration boards in the United Kingdom in 1905 655

ARMY.—Committee on civil employment of ex-soldiers and sailors. Report, together with appendix; Minutes of evidence, together with digest and index.

Presented (by Command). and ordered to lie on the Table 655

Page

NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.—Account of deposits in Naval Savings Banks and the payments thereof, and of interests thereon, of all investments under the Naval Savings Banks Act, 1866, and the application of the interest or dividends accruing in respect thereof, and of the proceeds of any sale of any stocks, annuities, or securities during the financial year 1904–1905. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 655

Criminal Appeal Bill [H.L.].—Order of the day for receiving Report of Amendments read.

The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 656

Moved, "That this Report be now received."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next and to be printed as amended [No. 156].

IMPERIAL DEFENCE.

Earl Roberts 656
The Earl of Dundonald 667
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Portsmouth*) 672
Viscount Milner 682
Lord Lovat 689
Lord Grimthorpe 690
The Marquess of Lansdowne 695
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) 698

MOTOR CAR COMMISSION.
The Earl of Powis 701
The Earl of Granard 701

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Seven o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, TUESDAY, 10TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

WORCESTER ELECTION.—King's Answer to Address reported 701

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Midland Railway Bill; Uxbridge Gas Bill. Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to 701

Newport Corporation Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered. An Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time 702

Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 702

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [LORDS].—To be read a second time To-morrow 702

July 10.] *Page*

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill.—"To confirm a Provisional Order under The Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, relating to Paisley Gas and Water," presented by Mr. Sinclair.

Ordered, That Standing Order 193a be suspended and the Bill be read the first time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the first time, and (under Sections 9 and 16 of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) ordered to be read a second time upon Wednesday, July 18th, and to be printed. [Bill 304] 702

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).—Ordered, That Robert Sydney Marsden do attend the Committee on Group J of Private Bills to-morrow, at half-past eleven of the clock 702

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill [LORDS] (By Order); South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords] (By Order).—Read a second time, and committed 702

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Cardiff Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 702

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—London and South Western Railway Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill; Cheltenham Gas Bill; Metropolitan Water Board Bill; Peterborough Gas Bill; North East London Railway Bill; Huddersfield Corporation Bill; Cardiff Gas Bill; London County Buildings Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to Manchester Churches Bill [Lords]; Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill [Lords], without Amendment 703

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: from Bawtry with Austerfield; Bristol; Burton-upon-Trent; Crediton; Hickling; and Lincoln; to lie upon the Table 703

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).—Petitions against alteration of Law: from Arlington; Godmanchester; Platt; and Trowell; to lie upon the Table 703

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).—Petition from Long Sutton, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 703

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 703

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 703

FOREIGN TRAWLERS (REGULATION) BILL.—Petition from Royal Burghs of Scotland, in favour; to lie upon the Table 703

LAND VALUES TAXATION, ETC., (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table 703

July 10.] Page

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.—Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table 703

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.—Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table 704

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].—Petitions for alteration; Aberdare (two); Banffshire; and Keith; to lie upon the Table 704

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL.—Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table 704

PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS BILL.—Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table 704

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petition from Long Compton, in favour to to lie upon the Table 704

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ORDNANCE SURVEY.—Copy presented, of Report of the Progress of the Ordnance Survey to March 31st, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 704

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).—Copy presented, of Colonial Report No. 487 (Weihaiwei, Report for 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 704

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS.—Copy presented, of Report on Strikes and Lock-outs of 1905, and on Conciliation and Arbitration Boards [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 704

SPAIN (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF).—Copy presented, of Translation of the New Customs Tariff of Spain, with Comparison of the Duties leviable under the Tariff in force prior to July 1st, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 704

NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.—Account presented, of Deposits in Naval Savings Banks, and the payments thereof, and the interest thereon, &c., during the financial year 1904–5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 246.] 704

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3664 and 3665 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 705

REVENUE (COLLECTION OF TAXES).—Return orderd, "showing for each of the three Kingdoms (1) the amount charged for Income Tax, Land Tax, and Inhabited House Duty for the financial years 1904, 1905, and 1906; and (2) the amounts and percentage of same collected in each country by the 31st day of January and the 28th day of February respectively in each of the said years (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 104, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. McCrae.*) 705

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHISTS AND VOLUNTEER CORPS.—Question, Mr. John Dewar (Inverness); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 705

July 10.] *Page*

RETURNS RELATING TO ADMINISTRATIVE BOARDS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 705

CONVICTS AS SERVANTS TO PRIVATE EMPLOYERS.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Churchill 706

BOARD OF EDUCATION LIBRARY.—Question, Mr. Thomson (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Birrell 706

CHILDREN OVER FOURTEEN ATTENDING STATE-AIDED SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Massie (Wiltshire, Cricklade); Answer, Mr. Birrell 707

SCHOOLS WITH EXTENDED FACILITIES—REPRESENTATIVES OF PARENTS.—Question, Mr. Samuel Roberts (Sheffield, Ecclesall); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 708

EDUCATION BILL—CLAUSE 4—EXPENSES OF PUBLIC INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch); Answer, Mr. Birrell 708

TEACHERS SUPERANNUATION FUND.—Question, Mr. Armitage (Leeds, Central); Answer, Mr. Birrell 709

CHILDREN OVER FOURTEEN ATTENDING STATE-AIDED SCHOOLS IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Massie; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 709

CHILDREN'S COURTS.—Question, Mr. H. J. Tennant (Berwickshire); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 710

VACCINATION EXEMPTION CERTIFICATES—CASE OF MR. W. C. PALMER OF MENIDGE.—Question, Mr. Montgomery (Somersetshire, Bridgwater); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 710

RAINFALL IN GUZERAT AND THE DECCAN.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, Mr. Morley 711

CHILDREN OVER FOURTEEN ATTENDING STATE-AIDED SCHOOLSIN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Massie; Answer, Mr. Bryce 711

ARMY PENSIONS—OUTSIDE INFLUENCE.—Question, Mr. Paul (Northampton); Answer, Mr. Haldane 712

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

TIDWORTH BARRACKS.—Question, Lord Castlereagh (Maidstone); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 712

NORWICH BARRACKS.—Questions, Lord Castlereagh; Answers, Mr. Haldane .. 712

ARMY ESTABLISHMENT SHORTAGE.—Question, Mr. Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 713

ARMY CHAPLAIN AND THE GOVERNMENT EDUCATION BILL.—Question, Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton); Answer, M. Haldane 714

ARMY PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Parker (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 714

UNDER-AGE RECRUITS.—Questions, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answers, Mr. Haldane 715

July 10.] *Page*

EDUCATION IN CEYLON.—Question, Sir C. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, The Under-Secretary for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. 716

INDIAN RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for India (Mr. John Ellis, Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) 717

REWARDS FOR KILLING TIGERS AND LEOPARDS.—Questions, Mr. Rees; Answers, Mr. John Ellis 717

ALLEGED HANGING OF A REPRIEVED NATIVE IN EASTERN BENGAL.—Questions, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answers, Mr. John Ellis 718

SLAVERY IN MOROCCO.—Questions, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answers, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 718

GREAT BRITAIN AND SERVIA—THE REGICIDES.—Questions, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.) and Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answers, Sir Edward Grey .. 719

METROPOLITAN POLICE AT RACE MEETINGS.—Questions, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey) and Mr. Mooney (Newry); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 720

MOTOR CAR ACCIDENTS.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 721

MR. H. H. CUNYNGHAME, C.B.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 722

CHESTER-LE-STREET VACCINATION PROSECUTION.—Question, Mr. J. W. Taylor (Durham, Chester-le-Street); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 722

TIN AND BLOCK PLATE.—Question, Mr. Parker (Halifax); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 723

TRUCK COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Parker; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 723

DEATH SENTENCES.—Question, Mr. Essex (Gloucestershire, Cirencester); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 724

CHESTER-LE-STREET VACCINATION PROSECUTION.—Question, Mr. J. W. Taylor; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 724

MILK TRADE.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 725

INCOME-TAX OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. Sears (Cheltenham); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) .. 725

ESTATE DUTY.—Question, Mr. Sears; Answer, Mr. McKenna 726

LAUNDRY INSPECTION.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Ashley 726

WELLS CHARITIES.—Question, Mr. Silcock (Somersetshire, Wells); Answer, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) 727

July 10.]

Page

PROTECTION OF FISHERIES.—Questions, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 728

CRIME IN CLARE.—Questions, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.), Mr. William Redmond, and Mr. MacVeagh; Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool) 728

DUNDRUM INNER BAY CROSSING.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 729

MRS. LEWIS'S ESTATE, WOODFORD.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 730

CROOKS TOWN FARM.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 730

LIMERICK EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 731

IRISH MAGISTRACY—FEES ON APPOINTMENT.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 732

IRISH HERRING FISHERY.—Questions, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 732

THE LORD-LIEUTENANT AND IRISH SELF-GOVERNMENT.—Questions, Captain Craig and Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 733

COURT FEES AT KING'S COUNTY ASSIZES.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Bryce 733

COUNTY CLARE POLICE.—Question, Mr. Halpin; Answer, Mr. Bryce 734

IRISH LAND PRICES.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Bryce 734

IRISH AGRICULTURAL ORGANISATION SOCIETY.—Questions, Mr. Delany and Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 734

IRISH POOR LAW COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 735

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL'S EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway); Answer, Mr. Bryce 736

LORD STRATHADEN AND CAMPBELL'S BARNA ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin; Answer, Mr. Bryce 736

CATTLE MUTILATION IN COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Bryce 737

LIMERICK LEARNERS' GRIEVANCE.—Questions, Mr. Delany; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. 737

KINGSBRIDGE TELEGRAPH STAFF.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 738

July 10.]

Page

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION BOARD.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, N.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 738

INDIAN BUDGET.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 739

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 739

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London), Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 739

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, &c., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 247.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 247.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 305.] 740

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following fifteen Members in respect of the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill: Mr. Clancy, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Charles Devlin, Mr. Field, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Luke White, Mr. Hart Davies, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. Hugh Barrie, Mr. Fetherstonshaugh and Mr. James Campbell.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee: That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill; Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. Herbert Samuel, and Mr. Cremer; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. James Bryce, and Mr. John Williams.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported: That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill: Mr. Halley Stewart; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Watt.

Reports to lie upon the Table 740

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

July 10.] *Page*

Clause 10 :—

Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 741

Amendent proposed—

"To omit sub-section (1)."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) .. 741

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'three Commissioners to be appointed by His Majesty' and to insert the words 'The Right Hon. Sir Arthur Wilson, K.C.I.E., Sir Hugh Owen, G.C.B., and Mr. Worsley-Taylor, K.C.' "—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause" —put, and negatived.

Words inserted.

Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 741

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 14, to leave out 'sub-section (3).' "—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 742
Lord Balcarres 742
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 743
Mr. Birrell 743

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Ashley (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 744

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 20, after word 'Commissioners' to insert the word 'each of them, subject to an appeal to the three Commissioners sitting together.' "—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) .. 745
Mr. Birrell .. 745
Sir William Anson .. 747
Mr. Talbot (*Oxford University*) .. 747
Mr. Birrell .. 747
Lord Balcarres .. 747
Lord Morpeth (*Birmingham, S.*) .. 748

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Helmsley (*Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk*) .. 749

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 27, to leave out the words 'His Majesty may by Order in Council,' and insert 'Parliament may'"—(*Viscount Helmsley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Birrell .. 750
Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 751

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question, "That Clause 9, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 10 :—

Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) ..

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 2, after the words 'charitable trusts,' to insert the words 'solely of an educational character.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell .. 752
Sir William Anson .. 753
Mr. Burdett Coutts (*Westminster*) .. 753
The Solicitor-General (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) .. 753
Lord R. Cecil .. 754
Mr. Birrell .. 755
Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 755

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Cave (*Surrey, Kingston*) .. 756

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 34, to leave out the words 'without payment.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Birrell 757
Mr. A. J. Balfour 758
Mr. Birrell 759

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 343 ; Noes, 98. (Division List No. 205.)

Mr. Ashley 763

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 36, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'in accordance with the terms of the trust.' "—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 764
Sir William Anson 765

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Clough (*Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton*) 765

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 38, to leave out at the end of sub-section the word 'nine' and to insert the words 'ten, or such later date as the Board of Education may in any case decide.' "—(*Mr. Clough.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'nine' stand part of the clause."

Dr. Macnamara (*Camberwell, W.*) 766
Lord R. Cecil 766
Mr. Birrell 767

Question put, and negatived.

Question, "That the word 'ten' be there inserted" put, and agreed to.

Lord R. Cecil 767

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 4, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'not do anything which shall render the schoolhouse less fit for the other purposes of the trust and shall.' "—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 768
Mr. A. J. Balfour 769
Sir Francis Powell 769

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord Balcarres 770

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 5, to leave out the word 'permit' and insert the word 'cause.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Austin Taylor (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) 770
Mr. A. J. Balfour 773
Mr. Birrell 773

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord R. Cecil 774

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 6, to leave out the word 'permit' and to insert the words 'subject to the provisions of this Act,' and so far as practicable, cause.'"

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out to stand part of the Question."

Mr. A. J. Balfour 774
Dr. Macnamara 775
Sir William Anson 776
Mr. Yoxall (*Nottingham, W.*) 777
Mr. A. J. Balfour 777
Mr. Blake (*Longford, S.*) 778
Dr. Macnamara 778
Mr. Stuart Wortley (*Sheffield, Hallam*) 779
Sir W. Robson 779
Mr. R. Pearce (*Staffordshire, Leek*) 779
Mr. Austin Taylor 779

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Ashley 780

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 8, at the end, to add the words, 'And the local education authority shall have no power to dismiss teachers except on educational grounds.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 781
Sir William Anson 782

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 152 ; Noes, 326. (Division List, No. 206.)

Mr. Ashley 785

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 8, at the end, to insert the words 'And no teacher shall be appointed by the local education authority, except in accordance with the terms of the trust.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell 785

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 8, at end, to insert the words 'and if a vacancy arises in the office of teacher while the schoolhouse is used under this section, the local education authority shall, in choosing the teacher, appoint a teacher who is willing to give the religious instruction required under this section.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Perks (Lincolnshire, Louth) 787
Dr. Macnamara 789
Mr. A. J. Balfour 789
Mr. Ellis Griffith (Anglesey) 790
Mr. Birrell 790
Mr. Herbert (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) 791
Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby) 792
Mr. Clough (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton) 792

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 369 ; Noes, 51. (Division List, No. 207.)

Sir E. Carson 797

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 8, after the words last inserted, to insert the words, 'Section 6 of this Act shall not apply while a schoolhouse is used under this section.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir W. Robson 797
Lord R. Cecil 798
Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) 798
Dr. Macnamara 799
Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 800

July 10.]

Page
Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry) 800
Lord Morpeth 801
Lord Balcarres 801
Viscount Castlereagh (Maidstone) 802
Mr. Napier (Kent, Faversham) 802
Sir E. Carson 803
Sir W. Robson 803
Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) 804
Mr. Compton Rickett (Yorkshire, W.R., Osgoldcross) 804
Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington) 805
Viscount Helmsley 805
Mr. Helme (Lancashire, Lancaster) 806
Sir William Anson 806
Mr. Middlemore (Birmingham, N.) 808

Question put.

Committee divided :—Ayes, 110 ; Noes, 258. (Division List, No. 208.)

Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 811

Amendment proposed—

"To add after the words last inserted in line 8, the words 'while the schoolhouse is so used the local education authority shall pay the salaries of the teachers during the whole time the school is open, including the time set apart for religious instruction.' "—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there added."

Mr. Birrell 814
Sir William Anson 815
Mr. Lane-Fox 816
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) 816
Viscount Helmsley 817
Sir William Anson 818

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 65 ; Noes, 333. (Division List No. 209.)

Dr. Macnamara 824
Mr. A. J. Balfour 824
Mr. Birrell 825

Question, "That Clause 10, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 11 :—

Mr. Ashley 825

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 15, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'held or maintained under charitable trusts.' "—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there inserted."

Sir W. Robson 826
Lord R. Cecil 827
Sir E. Carson 828
Mr. Cave 829
Mr. Paul 829
Mr. Birrell 830
Mr. Cave 833
Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 834

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 107 ; Noes, 309. (Division List, No. 210.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of Clauses 11, 12, and 13.

Question put, " That Clause 11 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 395 ; Noes, 108. (Division List, No. 211.)

Clause 12 agreed to.

Question put, " That Clause 13 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 397 ; Noes, 111. (Division List No. 212.)

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out Part II. (Clauses 14 to 24 inclusive)."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, " That Part II. stand part of the Bill," put forthwith, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, and negatived.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again To-morrow.]

The House resumed.

Shropshire, Worcestershire and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill.— Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) 849
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport 851
Mr. Middlemore (Birmingham, N.) 852

Question put and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Eleven o'clock

July 11.] Page

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 11TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [LORDS].—Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [Lords]; Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [Lords]; Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time 853

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Read a second time, and committed 853

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 853

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against; From Bampton; Derby; Elmstead; Hope Bagot; Kensal Green; and Wigan. To lie upon the Table 853

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).—Petitions against alteration of Law; From Leadenham; Luddesdown (two); Potters Bar; and Snodland. To lie upon the Table 853

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Paisley, against; to lie upon the Table 853

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1901) AMENDMENT BILL.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 853

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.—Petition from Dorking, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 854

JURORS' EXPENSES BILL.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 854

LAND VALUES TAXATION, ETC. (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against; From Glasgow (two); Kirkintilloch; and Perth. To lie upon the Table 854

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 854

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.—Petition from Walsall, against; to lie upon the Table 854

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].—Petitions for alteration; From Brighton; Govan; Honiton; Huntly; Stretford; West Aberdeenshire; and Westminster; to lie upon the Table 854

POTTER, ROBERT HENRY.—Petition from Robert Henry Potter, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table 854

June 26.] *Page*

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [LORDS].—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 854

RAILWAY TICKETS BILL.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 854

TRADE DISPUTES BILL.—Petition from Walsall, against; to lie upon the Table .. 854

TRADE UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.—Petition from Walsall, against; to lie upon the Table 654

TRUST ACCOUNTS (AUDIT) BILL.—Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table 854

VAGRANT CHILDREN BILL.—Petition from Keynsham, against; to lie upon the Table 854

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH FISHING-BOAT BUILDING.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 27th March; *Sir Thomas Esmonde*]; to lie upon the Table 855

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901.—Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of The Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and of the Money received, expended, and borrowed, and Securities created under the said Act, to 31st March, 1906, together with a Copy of the Report of the Chairman of the Pacific Cable Board [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 248] 855

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES].—Copy presented, of Draft Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department under the Prisons Acts, 1877 and 1898, with respect to the constitution of the Visiting Committees of Bristol and Shepton Mallet Prisons [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 855

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Accrington, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain shops within the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 855

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3666 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 855

TRANSVAAL.—Copies presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Labour in the Transvaal Mines [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 855

INCLOSURES (COUNTY OF SUFFOLK).—Return ordered, "showing (1) the number of Inclosures of common land made under the Inclosure Acts of 1845 to 1899 in the County of Suffolk; (2) list of parishes within which such lands are wholly or partly situate; (3) total acreage of such Inclosures; (4) average acreage of such Inclosures."—(*Mr. George Hardy*) 855

LAND JUDGES COURT (IRELAND).—Return ordered, "by counties, of the Estates in the Land Judges Court over which Receivers have been appointed (in continuation of Parliamentary Papers, No. 182, of Session 1904, and No. 256, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. Clancy*) 856

Page

July 11.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

RAFFLING AT LOCKERBIE TOWN HALL.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Sir John Walton 856

ANNUAL REPORT OF EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. Kearley 856

TELEPHONE FACILITIES AT FINCHLEY AND HENDON.—Question, Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 856

SALES ON THE WARRENSCOURT ESTATE, COUNTY CORK.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 857

MACROOM DISTRICT COUNCIL AND EXTRA LAND FOR LABOURERS' COTTAGES.—Question, Mr. Sheehan; Answer, Mr. Bryce 857

CROFTERS' ACT AMENDMENT BILL—DATE OF INTRODUCTION.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 858

LISBURN WORKHOUSE OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 858

ITALIAN GOVERNMENT AND BRITISH PILCHARDS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 859

GRANT FOR PIER AT ARDARROCK, KISHORN.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 859

ARREARS OF RATES.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 859

PATENT AGENTS.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Mr. Kearley 860

BALNAMORE POSTAL DELIVERY DELAYS.—Question, Mr. Glendinning (Antrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 860

TAW AND TORRIDGE GRAVEL BEDS.—Question, Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple); Answer, Mr. McKenna 861

BOARD OF TRADE AND TRINITY HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Soares; Answer, Mr. *Kearley* 862

SHIPOWNERS' COMMITTEE ON COAST LIGHTING.—Question, Mr. Soares; Answer, Mr. Kearley 862

ESTUARY OF THE TAW AND TORRIDGE.—Question, Mr. Soares; Answer, Mr. Morley 863

BOARD OF EDUCATION STAFF.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Birrell 863

ESTATE DUTY COMMITTEE WITNESSES.—Question, Mr. Sears (Cheltenham); Answer, Mr. Asquith 863

SHORT SERVICE ARMY PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Snowden (Blackburn); Answer, Mr. Haldane 864

PAPERS ON SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 864

TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE COLONY CONSTITUTION.—Question, Mr. Lyttelton; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 864

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

THE NAVAL MANŒUVRES.—Question, Mr. Beauchamp (Suffolk, Lowestoft); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 865

BIRMINGHAM SMALL ARMS COMPANY.—Question, Mr. Branch (Middlesex, Enfield); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.) 865

SPARKBROOK FACTORY.—Question, Mr. Branch; Answer, Mr. Buchanan .. 866

PIERSHILL CAVALRY BARRACKS.—Question, Lord Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 866

PRESTON BARRACKS, BRIGHTON.—Question, Lord Turnour; Answer, Mr. Buchanan 866

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY OFFICERS' PAY.—Questions, Lord Turnour and Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answers, Mr. Buchanan 867

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN—ARMY CANDIDATES.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 867

ARMY STATISTICS.—Question, Major Anstruther Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 868

SENTENCES ON CHINESE COOLIES.—Question, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 868

SINGAPORE DOCKS.—Question, Sir C. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 869

ROSETTENVILLE CITIZENS AND THE COOLIE OUTRAGES.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 870

NOURSE DEEP MINE—COOLIE RIOT.—Question, Mr. Mackarness; Answer, Mr. Churchill 870

ALLEGED FLOGGING IN THE CASON MINE.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Churchill 871

NATIVE RISING IN NATAL, TREATMENT OF SURRENDERED PRISONERS.—Questions, Mr. Keir-Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil), Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Lupton (Sleaford); Answers, Mr. Churchill 872

CRIMES BY CHINESE COOLIES.—Questions, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham) and Mr. Mackarness; Answers, Mr. Churchill 873

Page

July 11.]

WIZAGAPATAM RAILWAY AND HARBOURS.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, The Under Secretary for India (Mr. John Ellis, Rushcliffe) 874

DOG TAX.—Question, Mr. Sears (Cheltenham); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) 874

LECKHAMPTON RIGHT OF WAY RIOTS.—Question, Mr. S. Collins (Lambeth, Kennington); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 875

TRAMWAY GRADIENTS.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 876

VACCINATION EXEMPTION CERTIFICATES.—Question, Mr. Lupton; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) .. 877

STAINES WORKHOUSE CHILDREN AND ASCOT RACES.—Question, Mr. Spicer (Hackney, Central); Answer, Mr. John Burns 877

GROVE PARK WORKHOUSE.—Question, Mr. Barker (Penryn and Falmouth); Answer, Mr. John Burns 878

TRADE TRAFFIC IN LONDON STREETS.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. John Burns 818

FINDHORN POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. A. Williamson (Elgin and Nairn); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton) 879

CANADIAN MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin (Galway); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 879

GOVERNMENT EDUCATION GRANT ALLOCATION.—Questions, Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol) 879

MEDICAL OFFICERS TO EDUCATION AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, Mr. Birrell 880

CONTROL OF STATE-AIDED SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. J. F. Mason (Windsor); Answer, Mr. Birrell 881

SCHOOL HOURS.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley): Answer, Mr. Birrell 881

TRAINING COLLEGE STUDENTS AND VACCINATION.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Birrell 881

GALWAY SESSIONAL DIVISIONS.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) 882

IRISH LAND PURCHASE—DISSATISFIED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 883

EVICTED FARMS AND UNTENANTED LANDS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 883

July 11.]

Page

PURCHASE AGREEMENTS AT EXCESSIVE PRICES.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 884

LOCAL GOVERNMENT INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 884

TENANTS' IMPROVEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 885

IRISH LAND COMMISSION PROCEDURE.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce 885

ELPHIN UNITED IRISH LEAGUE MEETING.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid) and Mr. Hayden (Roscommon); Answers, Mr. Bryce 886

CORNANUNA SCHOOL TEACHER.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 888

CRAUGHWELL EVICTED FARM.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 888

DR. DOUGLAS HYDE.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, Mr. Bryce 889

EARL OF LEITRIM'S DONEGAL ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 890

IRISH LAND SUB-COMMISSIONERS.—Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 890

POLICE PROTECTION BOAT AT CORRACUNNA.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 891

CORRACUNNA FARM DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. William Abraham; Answer, Mr. Bryce 892

BARNA PIER, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Charles Devlin; Answer, Mr. Bryce 892

IRISH LAND VALUATIONS—COMPLAINT AGAINST MR. LIONEL CROASDALE.—Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answers, Mr. Bryce 892

GLENSHARROLD ESTATE, COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 893

DELMEGE ESTATE, COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 893

GLENSHARROLD EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 894

DUBLIN CORPORATION AND THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDITOR.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 894

BALLYLONGFORD EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 894

CARRIEKERRY (LIMERICK) POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 895

July 11.] *Page*

WELSH CHURCH INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 896

EDUCATION VOTE.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 896

TRANSVAAL SELF-GOVERNMENT AND COOLIE IMPORTATION.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 896

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.—Question, Dr. Shipman (Northampton); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 896

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London), Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), and Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 897

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added the following Member to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures: Mr. William Redmond.

Report to lie upon the Table 899

Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 249.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 249.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 306.] 899

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.—Sixth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 899

NEW BILLS.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill.—"To enable Regulations to be made for the prevention of danger arising to Public Health from the importation, preparation, storage, or distribution of articles of Food," presented by Mr. John Burns; supported by Mr. Runciman; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 307.] 900

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

July 11. *Page*

Clause 25 :—

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the clause."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the clause stand part of the Bill," put forthwith, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, and negatived.

Clause 26 :—

Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 900

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 16, to leave out from the beginning, to the word 'any,' in line 18, and insert the words 'Each county council shall delegate to the council of any borough (other than a metropolitan borough), or of any urban or rural district, or of any parish within the county, or to local education committees constituted in areas as hereinafter provided the exercise of.' "—(*Mr. George White.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'If' stand part of the clause."

Viscount Morpeth (Birmingham, S.) 902
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 904
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) 905
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 907
Mr. Adkins (Lancashire, Middleton) 907
Sir Francis Powell (Wigan) 909
Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) 911
Mr. Harvey (Rochdale) 913
Mr. A. J. Balfour 914
Mr. Stuart (Sunderland) 917
Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) 919
The President of the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. 920
Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.) 924
Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe) 927
Mr. Cheetham (Stalybridge) 928
Sir William Anson (Oxford University) 929
Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) 950
Mr. Winfrey (Norfolk, S.W.) 931
Mr. Verney (Buckinghamshire, N.) 932
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 933
Sir Philip Magnus (London University) 934
Mr. A. J. Balfour 935
Mr. Birrell 936
Colonel Williams (Dorsetshire, W.) 937
Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) 938
Viscount Morpeth 939

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) 940
Mr. Birrell 940

July 11.] Page

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 17, to leave out the words 'or of any parish.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Mr. Birrell 941
Mr. Walter Long 942

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause disagreed to.

Clause 27 :—

Sir James Woodhouse (*Huddersfield*) 942

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 38, to leave out the word 'compulsory.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr Birrell 942

Question put and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 38, to insert the words 'either compulsorily or by agreement.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Walter Long 943

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 22, to leave out the words 'Board of Education' and to insert the words 'local education authority.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 27, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Stuart 944
Lord R. Cecil (*Marylebone, E.*) 944
Mr. Birrell 944
Mr. Walter Long 945
Sir James Woodhouse 945
Lord R. Cecil 946

Question put and agreed to.

Clause 28 :—

Mr. Armitage (*Leeds, Central*) 946

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 31, to leave out the word 'sixty' and insert the word 'eighty.'"—(*Mr. Armitage.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (*Mr. Lough, Islington,* W.) 948
Sir Francis Powell 948
Mr. J. F. Mason (*Windsor*) 948

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir James Woodhouse 949

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 38, at the end, to add the words, 'and the Local Government Board may extend, to a period not exceeding sixty years from the date of the original loan, the period within which any loan raised by a local education authority for the purposes of the Education Acts after the passing of the Education Act, 1902, shall be repaid.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Lough 950
Sir William Anson 950
Mr. J. W. Wilson (*Worcestershire, N.*) 950
Sir James Woodhouse 951
Mr. Lough 951
Colonel Williams 951
Sir Henry Craik (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) 951

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. J. F. Mason 952

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 31, to leave out the word 'sixty' and insert the words 'thirty-five.'"—(*Mr. J. F. Mason.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'sixty' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Lough 952
Mr. Burdett-Coutts (*Westminster*) 952
Sir William Anson 953
Lord Balcarres 954
Mr. Summerbell (*Sunderland*) 956

July 11.] Page

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 309 ; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 213.)

Motion made, and Question " That Clause 28 stand part of the Bill," put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 309 ; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 214.)

Clause 29 :—

Mr. Harold Cox (*Preston*) .. 963

Amendment proposed—

> " In page 17, line 42, at the end, to add the words 'but before any increase is made in the existing rate, or any loan is raised for the purposes of education, other than elementary, in any county, county borough, borough, or district, it shall be ascertained by a poll of the ratepayers within the said county, county borough, borough, or district, that a majority of such ratepayers are in favour of the increase."—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, " That those words be there added."

Mr. Birrell .. 967
Mr. Walter Long .. 967
Mr. Osmond Williams (*Merionethshire*) .. 970
Sir Philip Muntz (*Warwickshire, Tamworth*) .. 971
Mr. Paul (*Northampton*) .. 971
Sir William Anson .. 971
Sir F. Banbury .. 972
Mr. Laurence Hardy .. 972

And, it being half-past Ten of the Clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, " That those words be there added."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 90 ; Noes, 389. (Division List No. 215.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN then proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of June 18th, to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of Clauses 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, and of any Amendments thereto proposed by the Government, of which notice had been given.

Question put, " That Clause 29 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 391 ; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 216.)

Clause 30 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 31 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 32 agreed to.

July 11.] *Page*

Clause 33 :—

Question put, " That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 389 ; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 217.)

Clause 34 disagreed to.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

Labourers (Ireland) [Advances].—Order for the House to be put into Committee read.

Committee deferred till To-morrow 989

Adjourned at twenty-six minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 12th JULY, 1906.

Earldom of Norfolk.—Committee for Privileges met : Counsel further heard in reply on behalf of the claimant, Lord Mowbray ; The Attorney-General, K.C., M.P., heard on behalf of the Crown ; Committee adjourned to Monday, the 23rd instant 993

The Lord Inverclyde sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother 993

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with : South Lincolnshire Water ; Watford and Edgware Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 993

Hammersmith, City, and North-East London Railway Bill.—Message from the Commons of Thursday last to be considered on Tuesday next .. 993

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill.—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn 993

Todmorden Corporation Bill.—Reported with Amendments 993

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 993

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; Watford and Edgware Railway Bill ; —Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, " That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª ; agreed to ; Bills read 2ª accordingly 993

Page
July 12.]

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways Bill [H.L.]; Newtownards Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to 994

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 994

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill.—Committed for Tuesday next .. 994

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill.—Brought from the Commons 994

Sutton District Water Bill; South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners 994

Midland Railway Bill; Uxbridge Gas Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 994

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill.—Reported without Amendment 994

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.—Moved, That the Order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to: Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 994

Glasgow and South-Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]; read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 994

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed 994

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Water Provisional Order Bill; St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Poole Corporation Water Bill; Cork City Railways and Works Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.), E. Stradbroke. L. Zouche, L. Borthwick, L. Castlemaine, L. Kintore (*E. Kintore*) (Chairman); agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly: The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills 994

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill.—Read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 158) 995

PETITIONS.

Education.—Petition in favour of denominational religious teaching in schools; of inhabitants of Firle signing; read, and ordered to lie on the Table .. 995

July 12.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Regulations for technical schools, schools of art, and other schools and classes for further education (from August 1st, 1906, to July 31st, 1907) 995

TRANSVAAL.—Further correspondence relating to labour in the Transvaal mines (in continuation of [Cd. 2819] February, 1906) 995

HOUSE OF COMMONS (VENTILATION).—Appendix to Report of the Committee appointed to investigate and advise the First Commissioner of Works with regard to the improvement of the ventilation of the House of Commons 995

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3666. Portugal (Lourenço Marques).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 995

Crown Office—Rules, 1906 995

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901 (ACCOUNT 1905–1906).—Account showing the money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and the money received, expended, and borrowed, and securities created under the said Act, to March 31st, 1906; together with report of the Chairman of the Pacific Cable Board 996

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES) (VISITING COMMITTEES).—Draft Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department under the Prison Acts, 1877 and 1898, with respect to the constitution of the visiting Committees of Bristol and Shepton Mallet Prisons 996

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Order made by the Council of the borough of Accrington, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the borough.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. 996

Ground Game Bill.

House in Committee (according to order.)

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 :—

Lord Saltoun 996

Amendment moved—

"In line 3, to leave out the word 'April' and insert the word 'September.'"—(*Lord Saltoun.*)

July 12.]

Page

Lord Burghclere 997
The Marquis of Lansdowne 998
Earl Beauchamp 1000
Lord James of Hereford 1000
Lord Lovat 1001
Lord Burghclere 1001

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee ; and to be printed as amended. (No. 157).

Criminal Appeal Bill [H.L.].—Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord Alverstone 1002
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 1005

On Question, Bill read 3ª ; an Amendment (Privilege) made ; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

SPEECHES OF IRISH MAGISTRATES.

Lord Muskerry 1009

Moved, for a Return of magistrates who have been appointed in Ireland during the last twelve months.—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

Lord Denman 1016
The Earl of Mayo 1021
Lord Ashbourne 1021
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 1023
The Marquess of Londonderry 1024
Lord Muskerry 1026

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 12TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Tyrone (East Tyrone), in the room of Patrick Charles Doogan, esquire, deceased.—(*Captain Donelan.*) 1026

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1027

Sutton District Water Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1027

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [Lords]; Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1027

Charing Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply Bill (by Order); City of London Electric Lighting Bill (by Order); West London Electric Undertakers' Association Bill (by Order).—Orders for Second Reading read and discharged; Bills withdrawn 1027

London Electric Supply Corporation Bill (by Order); South Metropolitan Electric Light and Power Bill (by order).—Orders for Second Reading read and discharged; Bills withdrawn 1027

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill.—Ordered, That in the case of the South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill, Standing Orders 84, 214, and 215 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into consideration.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill, as amended, considered accordingly:—

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed 1027

London Southern Tramways Bill.—Order [6th March], that the Bill be committed, read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1027

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1027

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill.—Order [10th July] for Second Reading upon Wednesday next, read, and discharged.

Bill referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1027

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill.—Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow 1028

Private Bills (Group I.).—Mr. Toulmin reported from the Committee on Group I. of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at a quarter before Twelve of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 1028

July 12.]

Page

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to, Amendments to—London and North Western Railway Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Kesteven, etc.) Bill [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 1028

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Devon, etc.) Bill [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow 1028

Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [LORDS].—County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill [Lords]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]; Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]; Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [Lords]; Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1028

Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table 1029

Portsmouth Water Bill [LORDS].—Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1029

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against; From Edensor; Horsley; Lillingstone Lovell; Little Hadham; and, Nottingham; to lie upon the Table 1029

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).—Petitions against alteration of Law; From Broughton; Halifax; and, Tickenhall; to lie upon the Table 1029

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.—Petition from Bucklow, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 1029

LAND VALUES TAXATION, &c. (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against; From Cadder; and, Glasgow; to lie upon the Table 1029

LAND VALUES TAXATION, &c. (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration, from Leith, and Stirling, to lie upon the Table 1029

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].—Petitions for alteration, from Guildford (two), Kirkdale, and South Nottingham, to lie upon the Table 1029

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNTENANTED LANDS (IRELAND).—Return [presented 3rd July] to be printed. [No. 250.] 1029

Prisons (England and Wales).—Paper [presented 11th July] to be printed. [No. 251.] 1029

Irish Fishing-Boat Building.—Return [presented 11th July] to be printed. [No. 252.] 1029

Board of Education.—Copy presented, of Regulations for Technical Schools, Schools of Art, and other Schools and Classes for further Education (from 1st August, 1906, to 31st July, 1907) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1030

Taxes and Imposts.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th May; *Mr. Goddard*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 253.] .. 1030

House of Commons (Ventilation).—Copy presented, of Appendix to Report of the Committee appointed to investigate and advise the First Commissioner of Works with regard to the improvement of the Ventilation of the House of Commons [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1030

Paper Laid upon the Table by the Clerk of the House.—Crown Office Rules, Copy of Crown Office Rules, 1906 [by Act] 1030

Local Government Inspectors (Ireland).—Return ordered, "of all the Inspectors now in the service of the Local Government Board, showing in respect of each, (1) his name; (2) date of original appointment; (3) age on appointment; (4) whether he obtained the appointment by competitive examination, or by nomination and examination; (5) if nomination, name of nominator; (6) occupation previous to appointment; (7) experience of local government previous to appointment; (8) present salary; (9) travelling and other expenses in last financial year; (10) amount of pension, if any, to which in normal course he will become entitled."—(*Mr. Ginnell.*) 1030

Government Departments (Ireland).—Return ordered, "setting forth the name, age, length of service, and official position, of all salaried Officials in the various Government Departments in Ireland, who have been appointed (a) by nomination without examination; (b) by nomination with competition; (c) by nomination with qualifying examination."—(*Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh.*) 1030

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Naval Shipbuilding.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1031

Income Tax Arrears.—Question, Mr. Sears (Cheltenham); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1031

Income Tax Assessments.—Question, Mr. Sears; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. 1032

Income Tax Collection.—Question, Mr. Sears; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1033

Australian Mail Contract.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1033

Loughrea Police.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1034

Page

DUBLIN CORPORATION AND THE IRISH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1034

UNTENANTED LANDS IN WESTMEATH.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1035

DEFICIENCY OF OFFICERS.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1035

VACCINATION.—Question, Mr. Branch (Middlesex, Enfield); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1036

LOTHIANS IMPERIAL YEOMANRY.—Question, Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1036

COURTS MARTIAL.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1037

EXECUTION OF BRITISH SOLDIERS.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1037

SINGAPORE DOCKS.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1037

DISCHARGES FROM BARLINNIE GAOL.—Question, Mr. Wood (Glasgow, St. Rollox); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1038

FOREIGN POSTAGE RATES.—Question, Mr. H. Beaumont (Sussex, Eastbourne); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1039

SCHOOL FIRE DRILLS.—Question, Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.); Answer, Mr. Lough 1039

SCHOOL CODE.—Question, Mr. Yoxall; Answer, Mr. Lough 1040

FAULKNER ESTATE, QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Hammond (Carlow); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1040

TENANTS' IMPROVEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1341

CAPTAIN SANDES' ESTATE, QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1041

DRUMCOO EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1041

IRISH HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1042

MAYNEHALL EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1042

MULLYCASTLE EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1043

UPPER INNY DRAINAGE BOARD.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1043

SHORT WEIGHT AT ALDERSHOT CANTEEN.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1044

July 12.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

NAVAL MANŒUVRES.—Questions, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis), Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 1045

CRUISES IN THE LEVANT.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1045

WEI-HAI-WEI.—Question, Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1045

EXECUTION OF AN INDIAN NATIVE.—Question, Mr. Bright (Oldham); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 1046

INDIAN PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.—Question, Sir Philip Magnus (London University); Answer, Mr. Morley 1048

CHINESE CRIME IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1048

SOUTH AFRICAN TARIFF.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1048

TRANSVAAL IMPORTS.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1049

CONVICTIONS OF NATIVES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1049

NIGERIAN RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1050

KAFFIRS' WAGES.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1050

INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1050

CHINESE COOLIE CONTRACTS.—Questions, Mr. Verney (Buckinghamshire, N.), Mr. Lupton (Sleaford); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1050

RECRUITMENT OF KAFFIR LABOUR.—Question, Mr. Verney; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1051

COOLIE IMPORT LICENCES.—Questions, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside), Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 1051

THE DISTURBANCES IN NATAL.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1052

TRANSVAAL GAOL POPULATION.—Questions, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1052

ALLEGED CHINESE SCHOOL AT JOHANNESBURG.—Question, Mr. J. Ward; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1053

July 12.]

Page

Abyssinia.—Questions, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) and Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 1054

Prosecutions of Europeans in Egypt.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1054

The Denshawi Trial.—Questions, Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Belloc (Salford, S.), Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answers, Sir Edward Grey 1054

Death Duties.—Question, Mr. Sears; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) 1050

Factory Inspectors.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1058

Leckhampton Right of Way Dispute.—Questions, Mr. Essex (Gloucestershire, Cirencester) and Mr. Sears; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1059

Quack Medicines.—Questions, Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1059

German Gipsies at Hull.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1060

Case of Miss Chesshire.—Questions, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns) 1061

Vaccination Fees.—Question, Mr. J. Johnson (Gateshead); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1062

Motor Car Speeds.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1062

Australian Mail Contract.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1063

St. John School, Wakefield.—Question, Mr. Snowden (Blackburn); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) .. 1063

Dog Licence Exemptions.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 1063

Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew.— Question, Mr. Chiozza Money; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 1064

Deptford Cattle Market.—Question, Dr. Cooper; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 1065

North Tadworth Farm, Epsom.—Question, Mr. Alden; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 1065

Ecclesiastical Commission Estate in Durham.—Questions, Mr. A. Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle), Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answers, Mr. Charles Hobhouse 1066

LISKEARD TRAINING SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1066

UNECONOMIC HOLDINGS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 1067

ESTATES COMMISSION'S REGULATIONS.—Questions, Mr. Ginnell; Answers, Mr. Bryce 1067

DRUMRANEY OUTRAGE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1068

CARROLL V. CRYAN.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1068

WATERFORD EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Power (Waterford, E.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1069

DROMOD POLICE HUT.—Question, Mr. McKean (Monaghan, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1069

COOTEHILL EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. McKean; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1070

ROO ESTATE, GORT.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce.. 1070

POST OFFICE CONTRACTS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1071

WELSH DISESTABLISHMENT.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 1072

SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTITUTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale and Sir Gilbert Parker; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1072

ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE.—Questions, Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth), Mr. Cathcart Wason, and Mr. Paul (Northampton); Answers, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 1073

FOREIGN OFFICE VOTE.—Questions, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1074

Municipal Corporations Bill.—Lords Amendment to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to.—(*Mr. Vivian.*) 1074

POLICE AND SANITARY COMMITTEE.—Special Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 254.]

Minutes of Proceedings to be printed. [No. 254.] 1074

SUPPLY [16TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1906–7.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £559,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the War Office and Army Accounts Department, which will come in course of payment during the year ended on the 31st day of March, 1907."

The Secretary of State for War (*Mr. Haldane, Haddington*) 1074
Mr. Arnold-Forster (*Croydon*) 1119
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 1127
Mr. Guy Baring (*Winchester*) 1137
Sir J. Dickson Poynder (*Wiltshire, Chippenham*) 1139
Viscount Castlereagh (*Maidstone*) 1143
Colonel Herbert (*Monmouthshire, S.*) 1146
Colonel Lockwood (*Essex, Epping*) 1150
Mr. A. L. Lever (*Essex, Harwich*) 1151
Sir Carne Rasch (*Essex, Chelmsford*) 1155
Mr. Brace (*Glamorganshire, S.*) 1156
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 1157
Major Seely (*Liverpool, Abercrombie*) 1164
Mr. Haldane 1165
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 1171

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again"—(*Sir Howard Vincent*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

MOTOR-OMNIBUS ACCIDENT.—On the Motion for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. Rowlands (*Kent, Dartford*) 1171
The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. John Burns, Battersea*) 1172

Adjourned at eight minutes after Eleven o'Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: FRIDAY, 13TH JULY, 1906.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and Strathearn singly took the Oath.

The Earl of Lonsdale took the Oath 1173

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table 1173

July 13.] *Page*

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill.—The Lord Chancellor informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill: Ordered that the Bill be not further proceeded with 1173

St John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill.—The Lord Chancellor informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn: The orders made on the 3rd instant and yesterday discharged, and Bill committed for Tuesday next 1173

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 9) Bill.—A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee 1173

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1173

Bacup Corporation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments 1173

Edinburgh Corporation Bill.—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 1173

Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bil [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 1173

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill; Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1173

Municipal Corporations Bill; Wireless Telegraphy Bill.—Returned from the Commons, with the Amendment to each Bill agreed to 1177

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill.—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to 1174

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Egypt, No. 2 (1906).—Correspondence respecting the Turco-Egyptian Frontier in the Sinai Peninsula (with a Map) 1174

Ecclesiastical Discipline.—Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. Vols. I., II., III., Minutes of Evidence. Vols. IV., Index and Appendices.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1174

News in War Time.

Lord Ellenborough 1174
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) 1179

House adjourned at ten minutes before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 13TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Cardiff Gas Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered upon Monday next 1181

Cheltenham Gas Bill; Huddersfield Corporation Bill; London and South Western Railway Bill; London County Buildings Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1181

Manchester Corporation Bill.—Lords Amendments to be considered upon Monday next 1181

Metropolitan Water Board Bill; North East London Railway Bill; Peterborough Gas Bill.—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to .. 1181

Newport Corporation Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 1182

Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1182

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Devon, etc.) Bill [LORDS]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Kesteven, etc.) Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 1182

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next 1182

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to: Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways Bill [Lords].

Newtownards Urban Distict Council Bill [Lords]; without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the law respecting Appeals in Criminal Cases." [Criminal Appeal Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Glasgow and South Western Railway." [Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to make further provisions for the management of the English and Welsh estates devised by the Trust Disposition and Settlement of John Patrick Crichton Stuart, Marquess of Bute, deceased." [Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [Lords] 1182

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS] —Read the first time; and ordered, under Section 9 of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 308.] 1182

Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1183

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against: From Doveridge; East Coker; Gunnersbury; Horsley Woodhouse; South Stainley; Stapenhill; and, Watford; to lie upon the Table 1183

LAND VALUES TAXATION, ETC. (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Two Petitions from Partick, against; to lie upon the Table 1183

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].—Petition from London and other places, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1183

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.—Petition from Helmesford, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1183

SOUTH AFRICA (CONSTITUTIONS OF THE TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONIES).—Petition from Cape Colony, for enfranchisement of the coloured races; to lie upon the Table 1183

VAGRANT CHILDREN BILL.—Petition from Chard, against; to lie upon the Table 1183

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address July 9th; *Mr. Herbert Samuel*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 255.] 1183

EGYPT (No. 2, 1906).—Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the Turco-Egyptian Frontier in the Sinai Peninsula (with a Map) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1184

ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. Volumes I., II., and III., Minutes of Evidence. Volume IV., Index and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1184

IMPERIAL REVENUE (COLLECTION AND EXPENDITURE) (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered May 22nd; *Mr. John Robertson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 256] .. 1184

INCLOSURES (COUNTY OF SURREY).—Return ordered, "Showing (1) the number of Inclosures of common land made under the Inclosure Acts from 1845 to 1899 in the county of Surrey; (2) list of parishes within which such lands are wholly or partly situate; (3) total acreage of such Inclosures; (4) average acreage of such Inclosures."—(*Mr. Marnham.*) 1184

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.—Questions, Sir Benjamin Stone (Birmingham, S.); Answers, Mr. McKenna 1184

RAIDING OF WAREHOUSE OF MESSRS. JAFFE AND COMPANY OF MANCHESTER.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone.. 1186

July 13.] Page

POLICE AND CAB LOITERING.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1186

NEWSPAPER DISTRIBUTION BY CYCLISTS.—Question, Mr. Herbert (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1187

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY (IRELAND).—Questions, Mr. Mac Veagh (Down, S.); Answers, Mr. Kearley 1187

EDUCATION BILL—COMPENSATION FOR TEACHERS DISCHARGED.—Question, Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1188

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (GOVERNMENT BUSINESS).

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs*) 1188

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, until and including August 4th, Government Business be not interrupted under the Provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed; that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that no Motions be made to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 1190
Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1196
Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) 1197
The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) 1199
Mr. Keir-Hardie (*Merthyr Tydvil*) 1199
Mr. Arnold-Forster (*Croydon*) 1200
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 1201
Sir Frederick Banbury (*City of London*) 1201

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That, until and including August 4th, Government Business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed; that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that no Motions be made to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11.—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*)

LABOURERS (IRELAND) [ADVANCES].

Considered in Committee.

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the repayment to the Ireland Development Grant, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of such annual sum as may be advanced out of that fund, in pursuance of any

Act of the present Session to amend the Law relating to Labourers in Ireland, and to make provision with respect to the application of portion of the Ireland Development Grant.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next 1202

Wireless Telegraphy Bill.—Order for Consideration of the Lords Amendment read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Lords' Amendment be now considered."

Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 1202

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the word ' now,' and add the words ' upon this day three months.' "—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' now ' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Henniker Heaton (*Canterbury*) 1204
Mr. J. D. White (*Dumbartonshire*) 1205
The Postmaster-General (*Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) .. 1206
Mr. Lupton (*Lincolnshire, Sleaford*) 1207

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed " That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

Lord Balcarres 1207
Mr. Sydney Buxton 1208

Question put, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906-7.

CLASS II.

On the Order of the Day being read, there was a short pause, the Deputy-Chairman not having the necessary Papers to proceed with the Votes.

Sir Frederick Banbury (*City of London*) 1209

Page

July 13.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 1209
Sir Frederick Banbury .. 1209

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £75,335, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries."

Mr. Laurence Hardy (*Kent, Ashford*) .. 1209
Viscount Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) .. 1216
Sir Frederick Banbury .. 1219
Mr. Beck (*Cambridgeshire, Wisbech*) .. 1222
Mr. Summerbell (*Sunderland*) .. 1223
Mr. Gardner (*Berks, Wokingham*) .. 1224
Dr. Cooper (*Southwark, Bermondsey*) .. 1224
Mr. George Faber (*York*) .. 1226
Sir Edward Strachey (*Somersetshire, S.*) .. 1227
Mr. Stanley Wilson (*Yorkshire E.R., Holderness*) .. 1231
Mr. Rowlands (*Kent, Dartford*) .. 1232
Sir Edward Strachey .. 1232
Mr. Hicks Beach (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) .. 1232
Mr. Barnard (*Kidderminster*) .. 1233
Sir Carne Rasch (*Essex, Chelmsford*) .. 1234
Mr. Cathcart Wason (*Orkney and Shetland*) .. 1234
Mr. Rees (*Montgomery Boroughs*) .. 1234
Mr. Courtenay Warner (*Staffordshire, Lichfield*) .. 1235
Mr. Cairns (*Newcastle-on-Tyne*) .. 1235

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next .. 1236

SUPPLY [24TH MAY] [REPORT].—

Resolutions reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1906–7.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,053,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of Victualling and Clothing for the Navy, including the cost of Victualling Establishments at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £275,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Medical Services, including the cost of Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

July 13.] *Page*

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £14,700, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Martial Law, including the cost of Naval Prisons at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on 31st day of March, 1907."

4. "That a sum not exceeding £165,600, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Educational Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £65,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Scientific Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £426,600, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Royal Naval Reserve, the Royal Fleet Reserve (including Seamen Pensioner Reserve), and the Royal Naval Volunteers, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £482,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of various Miscellaneous Effective Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

CIVIL SERVICES.—CLASS VI.

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £358,969, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities under sundry Statutes, for Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities awarded by the Treasury, and for the Salaries of Medical Referees."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £122,644, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for making good Deficiencies on the Income Accounts of the funds for Trustee Savings Banks, Friendly Societies, and Post Office Savings Banks."

Resolutions agreed to 1236

SUPPLY [21ST JUNE] REPORT].

Resolution reported:

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906–7.—REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

"That a sum, not exceeding £10,496,741, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs."

Resolution agreed to 1238

Supply [28th June] [Report].

Resoluiton reported:

Civil Services and Revenue Departments Estimates, 1906-7.—Class II.

"That a sum, not exceeding £110,146, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Agriculture and other Industries and Technical Instruction for Ireland, and of the services administered by that Department, including sundry Grants in Aid."

Resolution agreed to 1238

Supply [7th June] [Report].

Resolutions reported:

Army Estimates, 1906-7.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,111,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Quarterings, Transport, and Remounts, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £4,492,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Supplies and Clothing, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £775,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Ordnance Department Establishments and the Supply and Repair of General Stores, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,543,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Supply and Repair of Armaments and Engineer Stores, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

5. "That a sum not exceeding £2,353,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Barrack Construction; for Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad (including Purchase of Land), and for the Staff in connection therewith, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

6. That a sum, not exceeding £132,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for certain Establishments for Military Education, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £77,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Sundry Miscellaneous Effective Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,694,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Rewards, Half-Pay, Retired Pay, Widows' Pensions, Wounds Pensions, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,684,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, and the In-Pensioners thereof; for Out-Pensions and for Gratuities awarded in Commutation and in lieu of Pensions; for the Maintenance of Lunatics for whom Pensions are not drawn; for Pensions to Schoolmistresses and Nurses; for Rewards for Meritorious Services; for Victoria Cross Pensions; and for Pensions, etc., to the Widows and Children of Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, and Men, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £180,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Civil Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities, also for Payments under the Workmen's Compensation Act, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906–7.—CLASS III.

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £26,953, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries of the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners of the Metropolitan Police, and of the Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District, the Pay and Expenses of Officers of Metropolitan Police employed on special duties, and the Salaries and Expenses of the Inspectors of Constabulary."

Resolutions agreed to. 1239

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House this day.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 16TH JULY, 1906.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Sutton District Water.

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10).

July 13.] *Page*

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with :—South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1241

London Squares and Enclosures Bill [H.L.].—The Marquess Camden consented to the Bill 1241

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill—(BARTON-UPON-IRWELL ORDER).—A petition of Messrs. Baker and Company of 54, Parliament Street, Westminster, Parliamentary Agents, praying for leave to present a petition of the Barton-upon-Irwell Rural District Council, praying to be heard by counsel against the Order, although the time limited by Standing Order No. 93 for presenting such petition has expired ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table, and Standing Order No. 93 to be considered To-morrow in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said petition 1241

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill—Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next 1241

Derby Gas Bill—Reported with Amendments 1241

Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [H.L.].—Reported with Amendments 1242

Water Provisional Order Bill—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill ; The orders of the 29th of June and Thursday last discharged. Ordered that the Bill be not further proceeded with 1242

Great Northern Railway Bill.—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on Tuesday and Thursday last discharged, and Bill committed for To-morrow 1242

South Lincolnshire Water Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, " That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª ; agreed to : Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed 1242

London Squares and Enclosures Bill—[H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 1242

London United Tramways Bill.—Watford Gas Bill. Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons 1242

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Devon, etc.) Bill [H.L.].—Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Kesteven, etc.) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to 1242

Newport Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments 1242

July 13.] *Page*

Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to 1242

Cheltenham Gas Bill—Huddersfield Corporation Bill. London and South Western Railway Bill. London County Buildings Bill. Metropolitan Water Board Bill. North East London Railway Bill. Peterborough Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to .. 1242

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.—Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, " That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to: Bill read 2ª accordingly 1243

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.—Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, " That this Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

On Question, Bill read 3ª.

Lord Monkswell 1243

Amendment moved.

" In the preamble, page 3, line 36, after the word ' made ' to insert ' and whereas it is expedient that the council should be empowered to establish and maintain, or to contribute toward or otherwise aid in the establishment and maintenance of an ambulance service for dealing with cases of accident and illness in the streets and other public places in the county. ' "

" In Clause 2, page 6, line 13, after the word ' Drainage ' to insert ' Part IV.—Ambulance Service.' ; in page 6, line 14, to leave out ' IV. ' and to insert ' V. ' ; in line 15, to leave out ' V.' and to insert ' VI. ' ; in line 17, to leave out ' VI,' and to insert ' VII.' ; and in page 19, line 5, after the word ' works ' to insert ' Part IV.—Ambulance Service.' 24. It shall be lawful for the council to establish and maintain, or to contribute towards the cost of or otherwise aid in establishing and maintaining an ambulance service for dealing with cases of accident and illness in the streets or other public places in the county. 25.—(1) The council may for the purpose of this part of this Act, and as and when they may think requisite for carrying such purposes into effect: (*a*) Appropriate, hold, and use any lands or buildings for the time being vested in them for any purpose for which such lands or buildings are not required: (*b*) take on lease, purchase by agreement, or otherwise acquire any lands or buildings within the county; (*c*) erect, or cause to be erected, and maintain, repair, and manage on any lands so appropriated or acquired, any buildings suitable for the said purposes; (*d*) adapt, furnish and equip any buildings so appropriated, acquired, or erected. (2) The council may from time to time sell, lease, or let any lands or buildings acquired by or vested in them for the purposes of this part of this Act, and not required for such purposes. (3) The council may for the purposes of this part of this Act contract with any company or persons for the establishment and maintenance of telegraphic, telephonic, or other

suitable means of communication between the several buildings used for the purposes of this part of this Act, and between any such building and other parts of the county. 26.—(1) For the purposes of this part of this Act the council may employ and pay such officers and servants as they may think expedient for the efficient conduct of the service authorised by this part of this Act. (2) The council may from time to time provide and maintain such ambulances and other vehicles to be drawn by hand, or by animal or electrical or other mechanical power, as they may think requisite for the accommodation and conveyance of persons meeting with accidents or seized with illness in the streets or public places in the county. Provided that any electrical power used for moving any such vehicle shall be entirely contained in and carried along with such vehicle in such a manner that no magnetic or other influence is created which is likely to affect injuriously any telegraphic line of the Postmaster-General."—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

Lord Leigh .. 1250
The Earl of Camperdown .. 1251
Viscount Knutsford .. 1254
The Chairman of Committee (*The Earl of Onslow*) .. 1255
Earl Beauchamp .. 1256
Lord Monkswell .. 1259

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.]

The Earl of Wemyss .. 1259

Amendment moved.

"In Part V. (Supply of Electric Fittings by Metropolitan Borough Councils), to leave out Clauses 27, 28, and 29."—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

The Earl of Camperdown .. 1262
Lord Clinton .. 1263
Lord Leith of Fyvie .. 1265
The Duke of Northumberland .. 1265
The Earl of Granard .. 1268
The Earl of Onslow .. 1268

On Question, Amendment negatived.

On Question, Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill.—Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

On Question, Bill read 3^a.

Lord Welby .. 1269

Moved, "After Clause 14, to insert as a new clause: For the further protection of the Gas Light and Coke Company, the South Metropolitan Gas Company, and the Metropolitan Water Board, the following provisions shall have effect: If it be proved that an injury or damage to any gas or water pipes or other metallic pipes, srructnres, or substances of either of the said companies or of the said board elsewhere than on

Blackfriars Bridge between the northern and southern abutments thereof shall have resulted from fusion or electrolytic action caused by any currents generated and used by the Corporation for the purpose of electric energy under this Act, nothing in this Act shall relieve the Corporation from any liability to make compensation for any such injury or damage which would have existed but for the passing of this Act."—(*Lord Welby.*)

The Earl of Onslow 1271
Lord Newton 1272
Viscount Ridley 1272
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 1273
Lord Welby 1273

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.]

RUSSIA AND THE FLEET.

Lord Monkswell 1274
The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (*Lord Fitzmaurice*) .. 1274

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION.—Petition in favour of denominational religious teaching in schools, of inhabitants of Firle signing ; read, and ordered to lie on the Table .. 1275

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS : ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3667. China (Hangchow).
No. 3668. Japan (Shimonoseki).
No. 3669. Brazil (Pernambuco).
No. 3670. Netherlands (Surinam) 1275

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879 TO 1900 (SCOTLAND).—Report of the Inspector for Scotland under the Inebriates Acts, for the year 1905 1275

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Statement showing syllabuses of religious instruction issued by diocesan and other associations for the use of Church of England schools.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1275

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Report of the Board of Education for the year 1904–5, on the administration of schools under the Welsh Intermediate Act, 1889 1275

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.—Order made by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries under the provisions of the above Act, for the variation of an order for creating the Northumberland Sea Fisheries District 1275

BANKRUPTCY,—Twenty-third General Annual Report by the Board of Trade, under Section 131 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 1275

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury Minute, dated July 11th, 1906, declaring that Hugo Marinitch, C.M.G., Dragoman, His Majesty's Embassy, Constantinople, was appointed without a civil service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department 1275

POLLING DISTRICTS.—Order made by—

The council of the West Riding of Yorkshire constituting polling districts in the Elland and Doncaster Parliamentary divisions of the county.

The council of the borough of Stockton-on-Tees altering certain polling districts in the borough.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1276

Conveyancing Bill [H.L.]; **Settled Land Bill** [H.L.]; **Married Women's Property Bill** [H.L.].—Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 1276

HORSE-BREEDING.

The Earl of Donoughmore 1276

Moved to resolve, "That, in view of the importance of the horse-breeding industry to the community in general, and of the necessity for an adequate and efficient supply of horses for military and other purposes, it is, in the opinion of the House, desirable that steps should be taken to improve the breeding of horses by giving effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding in their Tenth Report, especially to those having reference to the improvement of the quality of good mares."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

The Duke of Portland 1283
Lord Ribblesdale 1287
Lord Saltoun 1289
The Earl of Dunraven 1289
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (Earl Carrington) 1290
The Marquess of Londonderry 1294

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 16TH JULY, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill.

July 13.] Page

Ordered (under Section 9 of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) to be read a second time upon Wednesday 1296

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow 1296

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [LORDS]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1296

Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment 1296

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [LORDS]. (KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time and passed, with Amendments .. 1296

Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time and passed, with Amendments 1297

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1297

West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [LORDS].—As amended, considered: Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1297

Cardiff Gas Bill (BY ORDER); Manchester Corporation Bill (by Order).—Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to 1297

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [9th July], further adjourned till Wednesday .. 1297

Shoreditch and Stepney Electricity Bill (BY ORDER).—Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn 1297

Metropolitan Electric Supply Bill (BY ORDER).—Read a second time, and committed 1297

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments 1297

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [LORDS].—Read a second time, and ordered to be considered To-morrow 1297

Kent Electric Power Bill [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1297

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I.).—Mr. TOULMIN reported from the Committee on Group I. of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, at Eleven of the clock.

July 13.] *Page*

Report to lie upon the Table 1297

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill, Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for preventing by agreement with the present owners of certain lands in the administrative county of London the future erection of buildings and structures on such lands; and for other purposes." [London Squares and Enclosures Bill [Lords] 1297

London Squares and Enclosures Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1298

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.—Petitions against; From Loughton; West Felton; and Wigan; to lie upon the Table 1298

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).—Petition from Chadderton, against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 1298

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].—Petitions from Great Yarmouth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 1298

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA, WARLIKE OPERATIONS (KILLED AND WOUNDED).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 28th May; *Mr. Morton*]; to lie upon the Table 1298

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 3rd July; *Mr. Lloyd Morgan*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 257] 1298

POLLING DISTRICTS (BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Stockton-on-Tees altering certain Polling Districts in the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1298

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE).—Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire constituting Polling Districts in the Elland and Doncaster Parliamentary Divisions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1299

INEBRIATES ACTS (INSPECTOR'S REPORT) (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Report of the Inspector for Scotland, under the Inebriates Acts, for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1299

ALLOTMENTS (SCOTLAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd March; *Mr. Eugene Wason*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 258] 1299

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, under the provisions of the said Act, for the variation of an Order for creating the Northumberland Sea Fisheries District [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1299

July 13.] *Page*

Board of Education.—Copy presented, of Statement showing Syllabuses of Religious Instruction issued by Diocesan and other Associations for the use of Church of England schools [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1299

Board of Education (Welsh (Intermediate Education Act, 1889).—Copy presented, of Report of the Board of Education for the year 1904–5 on the Administration of Schools, under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 259] .. 1299

Superannuation Act, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 11th July, 1906, declaring that Hugo Marinitch, C.M.G., Dragoman, His Majesty's Embassy, Constantinople, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1299

Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland).—Return ordered, " showing the amount paid in each quarter of the period from the 1st day of April, 1900, to the 28th day of February, 1905, to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society in respect of each officer of the society whose services were utilised by the Department in giving instruction in agricultural subjects and organising agricultural home industries and agricultural audit societies."—(*Mr. Dillon*). 1300

Diplomatic Reports (Coal).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 12th March; *Mr. Fenwick*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 260] 1300

Bankruptcy.—Copy presented, of Twenty-third General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 261], ... 1300

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3667 to 3670 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1300

Post Office (Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 19) Warrant, 1906, dated June 28th, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1300

Joint Stock Companies.—Return ordered, " (I.) of the Companies registered during the year ended the 31st day of December, 1905, which filed a prospectus and to which certificates to commence business have been granted, stating—

(1) The date of registration.
(2) the date of the prospectus.
(3) the amount of the nominal capital.
(4) the amount of each share.
(5) the amount issued or to be issued otherwise than for cash.
(6) the amount offered for subscription in cash.
(7) the amount underwritten.
(8) the commission for underwriting.

(9) the minimum subscription required.

(10) the amount allotted before commencing business.

(11) the amounts per share payable on application and allotment.

(12) the total directors' share qualification, if any ; and

(13) the date of the certificate to commence business.

(II.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1905 which filed a prospectus, but to which certificates to commence business have not been granted, stating the particulars specified in (I.) so far as they are applicable.

(III.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1905 which filed a declaration that the Company "does not issue any invitation to the public to subscribe for its shares."

(IV.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1905 which have not filed a prospectus or a declaration that the Company "does not issue any invitation to the public to subscribe for its shares," and stating the particulars specified in (I.) so far as they are applicable.

(V.) Of the Companies which were dissolved or struck off the register during the year 1905.

(VI.) Of the total number of Companies dissolved during the year 1905 (1) by order of the Court ; (2) after voluntary liquidation ; and (3) pursuant to the provisions of Section 7 of The Companies Act, 1880, and Section 26 of The Companies Act, 1900.

(VII.) Of the total number and nominal paid-up and considered as paid-up capital of the Companies registered during the year 1905 in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin respectively, distinguishing limited Companies from unlimited, and Companies registered with a nominal capital from Companies registered without such capital.

(VIII.) Of the total number and paid-up capital, including the amounts considered as paid on vendors and other shares, of all Companies having a share capital which were on the register on the 30th day of April 1906, except such Companies as were in course of liquidation or removal from the register under the provisions of Section 7 of The Companies Act, 1880, and Section 26 of The Companies Act, 1900.

(IX.) Of the total number and nominal capital of the Companies registered in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively in every year since the commencement of The Companies Act, 1862, to 1905, inclusive.

(X.) Of the fees and capital duty paid in respect of Registered Companies during the year 1905."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*) 1300

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Sale of Grazing Farm at Leefin.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1302

Sale of a Grazing Farm on the Darcy Estate.—Question, Mr. Duffy ; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1303

July 13.]

Page

Riverside Open Spaces.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1303

Local Taxation.—Question, Mr. Morrell (Oxfordshire, Henley); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1304

Native Killed by Soldiers in Egypt.—Question, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1304

Sentence on the Rev. Edgar Stannard.—Question, Mr. Bennett (Oxfordshire, Woodstock); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1305

Denshawe Affray Papers.—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1305

El Azhar University Police Force.—Question, Mr. Dillon; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1306

Compulsory Purchase of Holding by Patrick McGlone.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1306

Irish Land Purchase Act—Sporting Rights.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1306

Enlargement of Holdings in the Rod Estate.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1307

Sale of the Lambert Estate, Athenry.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1307

Foreign Firms and Army Meat Contracts.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1308

Yeomanry Drill Book.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1308

Sanitary State of Egyptian Towns.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1309

Civil Service Boy Clerks.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. 1309

Grievances of Assistant Clerks in Customs Statistical Offices.—Question, Mr. Thornton (Clapham); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1310

Post Office Savings Bank Accounts.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1310

Refreshments at Kew Gardens.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington); Answer, Mr. Edward Strachey 1312

Kew Gardens—Offical Guides.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 1312

Capital Punishment.—Question, Mr. Essex (Gloucestershire, Cirencester), Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1312

Accidents Caused by Motor Traffic.—Question, Mr. Channing (Northamptonshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1313

IRISH RAILWAY CLEARING HOUSE RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 1314

TESTING OF MOTOR OMNIBUSES.—Question, Mr. Channing; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1315

IRISH RAILWAYS AND CANALS—APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1316

EXTENSION OF ALLOTMENTS ACT TO IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1316

SALE OF ROCKFIELD FARM, COUNTY WESTMEATH.—Question, Mr. Sullivan (Westmeath, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1316

IRISH LOCAL AUTHORITIES ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1317

BALLINAKILL OYSTER FISHERY BANKS.—Question, Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1318

PRISONERS DETAINED IN THE CLIFDEN BRIDEWELL.—Question, Mr. O'Malley; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1319

TULLYCROSS POLICE BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. O'Malley; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1319

PURCHASE OF CAPTAIN CALDBECK'S ESTATE BALLACOLLA.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1320

SUGGESTED GRANT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CUNNIGAR BRIDGE AND ROADWAY.—Question, Mr. O'Shee (Waterford, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1320

POOR LAW COMMISSION—IRISH MEDICAL MEMBER.—Question, Mr. O'Shee; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1321

COLONIAL MARRIAGES.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1321

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

SPARKBROOK FACTORY.—Question, Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.) 1321

GARRISON ARTILLERY MILITIA.—Question, Colonel Walker (Lancashire, Widnes); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 1322

COLDSTREAM GUARDS.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Buchanan 1322

PROCESSIONS IN INDIA—THE BANDE MATARAM.—Questions, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) and Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answers, The Under-Secretary for India (Mr. John Ellis, Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe).. 1323

EXECUTIONS OF BRITISH SOLDIERS IN INDIA.—Questions, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.) and Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, Mr. John Ellis .. 1324

July 13.] Page

SCOTSMEN AND INDIAN PUBLIC APPOINTMENTS.—Question, Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire); Answer, Mr. John Ellis 1326

NATAL GOVERNMENT—BILL OF INDEMNITY.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1326

OPIUM REVENUE COLLECTION.—Questions, Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch), and Mr. Lupton, Lincolnshire (Sleaford); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1326

EAST AFRICAN PROTECTORATE.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1327

THE CHIEF NANA.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1327

DISMISSAL OF BRITISH TEACHERS FROM CAPE COLONY.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.), and Mr. Arnold-Forster; Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 1328

OUTRAGES ON THE RAND.—Question, Mr. Mackarness (Berks, Newbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1329

JAPANESE IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1329

BRITISH INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1330

LABOUR RECRUITMENT IN AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, Mr. Churchil 1330

COTTON DUTIES IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Belloc (Salford, S.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1331

RELIGIOUS SERVICES IN MALTA.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill 1331

EMIGRATION TO BRITISH COLONIES. — Question, Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1332

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR.—Question, Sir C. Hill (Shrewsbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1332

TURCO-EGYPTIAN FRONTIER.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, The Secretary to the Local Government Board (Mr. Runciman, for Sir Edward Grey) .. 1332

EGYPTIAN SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1333

FIELD OF WATERLOO.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1333

ABANDONMENT OF THE BALTIC CRUISE OF THE BRITISH FLEET.—Question, Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1333

CUSTOM HOUSE QUAY.—Question, Mr. T. Davies (Fulham); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) 1334

July 13.] *Page*

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—Question, Mr. Rowlands (Kent, Dartford); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1334

CHILD INSURANCE.—Question, Mr. L. Haslam (Monmouth Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1335

VIVISECTION INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Mackarness; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1335

FOOD FACTORY INSPECTION.—Questions, Mr. Arthur Henderson (Durham, Barnard Castle); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1336

METROPOLITAN POLICE AND SUNDAY DUTY.—Question, Mr. T. Davies; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1337

BOY'S CONVICTION FOR BEGGING AT GATESHEAD.—Questions, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) and Mr. Lupton; Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1338

TRUCK ACT.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1339

MOTOR 'BUS TRAFFIC.—Questions, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answers, Mr. Gladstone 1339

IMPRISONMENT OF ANTI-VACCINATORS.—Question, Mr. Lehmann (Leicestershire, Market Harborough); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 1341

PONTARDAWE MEDICAL OFFICER OF HEALTH.—Question, Mr. J. Williams (Glamorganshire, W.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1341

ALLEGED ILL-TREATMENT OF A LUNATIC AT BRAMLEY UNION.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 1342

VACCINATION PROPHYLAXY.—Questions, Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Lupton; Answers, Mr. John Burns 1342

HYTHE BURIAL GROUND.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill; Answer, Mr. John Burns 1343

SHIPPING REBATES.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Burghs) 1343

SCHOOL AGE.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, The President to the Board of Education (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1344

LUTON SCHOOL LIBEL CASE.—Question, Mr. Barnes (Glasgow, Blackfriars); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1344

WEST RIDING (YORKSHIRE) TEACHERS' SALARIES.—Questions, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash); Answers, Mr. Birrell 1344

VACCINATION OF PUPIL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1345

EDUCATION APPEALS.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1345

July 13.] Page

IRISH ORDNANCE SURVEY MAP PRINTING.—Questions, Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answers, Sir Edward Strachey (Somersetshire, S.) 1346

PENSIONS OF SCOTTISH ASYLUM OFFICIALS.—Questions, Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Burghs) and Sir J. Jardine (Roxburghshire); Answers, the Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1347

BARLINNIE PRISON, GLASGOW.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1348

GLENTIES UNION CLERK'S SALARY.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) 1348

DISTRICT INSPECTOR WADE, ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1349

ESTATES COMMISSIONERS, CORRESPONDENCE.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1349

BALLINMORE EVICTION.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1350

IRISH EMIGRATION.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Bryce .. 1350

BAUN DRAINAGE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1351

MR. PATRICK HAIRE'S VALUATION.—Question, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, N.) and Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1352

CAVAN COUNTY EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1353

IRISH EXPERIMENTAL FARMS.—Questions, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1354

LUNACY (IRELAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow); Answer, Mr. Bryce 1355

COOLKILL EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Bryce 1355

IRISH RAILWAY INQUIRY.—Questions, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answers, Mr. Bryce 1356

TIMAHELY POST OFFICE, MEDICAL OFFICER.—Questions, Mr. James O'Connor; Answers, The Postmaster General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1356

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT FOR SOUTH AFRICAN COLONIES.—Questions, Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square), Mr. Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1357

IMPERIAL PREFERENCE RESOLUTION OF THE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE OF THE EMPIRE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1358

July 13.] *Page*

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES OF CURRENCY.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1359

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES.—Question, Sir Carne Rasch (Essex, Chelmsford); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1359

TREATMENT OF ZULU WOUNDED.—Questions, Mr. Lehmann, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.,) and Mr. Dalziel (Kickcaldy Burghs); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1360

NEW BILLS.

Deanery of Manchester Bill.—" To make further provision with respect to the Revenues of the Deanery of Manchester," presented by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 309.] 1360

Ecclesiastical Disorders (No. 2) Bill.—" To provide for the better enforcement of the Laws relating to public worship and to deal with Ecclesiastical Disorders in the Church of England," presented by Sir George Kekewich; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 310.] .. 1360

Education (England and Wales) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

In the Committee.

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 35:—

Sir Francis Powell (*Wigan*) 1361

Amendment proposed—

" In page 20, line 3, to leave out sub-section '(*a*).' "—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, " That sub-section (*a*), down to the words 'holidays; and,' stand part of the clause."

Mr. Ashley (*Lancashire, Blackpool*) 1363
The President of the Board of Education (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) .. 1365
Sir William Anson (*Oxford University*) 1366
Mr. Butcher (*Cambridge University*) 1367
Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 1368
Mr. Birrell 1369
Mr. A. J. Balfour (*City of London*) 1369

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. A. J. Balfour 1369

Amendment proposed—

“In page 20, line 4, after the word ‘classes’ to insert the words ‘in other than book work.’”—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

Question proposed, “That those words be there inserted.”

Mr. Birrell 1370

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 1370

Amendment proposed—

“In page 20, line 4, after the word ‘classes,’ to insert the words ‘play centres.’”—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, “That those words be there inserted.”

Question put, and agreed to.

Sir Francis Powell 1372

Amendment proposed—

“In page 20, line 5, after the word ‘school-houses,’ to insert the words ‘or elsewhere.’—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, “That those words be there inserted.”

Mr. Birrell 1373
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1373

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir James Woodhouse (*Huddersfield*) 1374
Lord Balcarres 1374
Mr. Rees (*Montgomery Boroughs*) 1374
Mr. Birrell 1375

Question put, and agreed to.

Sir William Anson 1375

Amendment proposed—

“In page 20, line 5, after the word ‘holidays,’ to insert the words ‘with the consent, in the case of transferred voluntary schools, of the owners or trustees of those schools.”—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, “That those words be there inserted.”

Mr. Birrell 1375

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. H. J. Tennant (Berwickshire) .. 1376

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 5, to leave out from the word 'holidays' down to the word 'to' in line 6, in order to insert '(b) the duty of every local education authority to make arrangements, in accordance with a scheme be made by the Board of Education, for attending to the health and physical condition of the children educated in public elementary schools.'"

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out down to the word 'to' in line 6, stand part of the clause."

Mr. Masterman (West Ham, N.) .. 1379
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) .. 1380
Dr. Macnamara (Camberwell, N.) .. 1382
Sir William Anson .. 1383
Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.) .. 1386
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) .. 1387
Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.) .. 1389
Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham) .. 1389
Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry) .. 1390
Mr. A. Williamson (Elgin and Nairn) .. 1391
Mr. A. J. Balfour .. 1392
Mr. Birrell .. 1395
Dr. Macnamara .. 1398
Mr. Lambton (Durham, S.E.) .. 1399
Mr. H. J. Tennant .. 1399

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Ashley .. 1399

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 35, page 20, line 6, after the word 'arrangements,' to insert the words 'not involving an expenditure in any one year exceeding the amount which would be produced by a rate of one penny in the pound.'"—(*Mr. Ashley*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The Solicitor-General (Sir W. Robson, South Shields) .. 1401
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) .. 1401

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir John Brunner (Cheshire, Northwich) .. 1401

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 6, to insert '(b) Power to make by-laws, subject to the approval of the Board of Education, to enforce the attendance of children at evening continuation schools or technical schools up to the age of seventeen years.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted.

Mr. Wyndham .. 1403
Dr. Macnamara .. 1405
Sir William Anson .. 1405
Mr. T. F. Richards (Wolverhampton, W.) .. 1407
Mr. Maddison (Burnley) .. 1407
Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucester, Tewkesbury) .. 1408
Sir Philip Muntz (Warwickshire, Tamworth) .. 1409
Sir Philip Magnus (London University) .. 1410
Sir John Brunner (Cheshire, Northwich) .. 1411
Mr. Massie (Wiltshire, Cricklade) .. 1411

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 6, to insert 'as power to provide, in public elementary schools, instruction of scholars in day schools up to the end of the school year in which the scholar reaches the age of sixteen.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Birrell .. 1414
Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) .. 1417
Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.) .. 1419
Sir William Anson .. 1420

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Maddison .. 1421

Amendment proposed—

"To insert at the end of the clause '(a) power of training and preparing pupil teachers up to the date of their entering a training college or becoming assistant teachers.'"—(*Mr. Maddison.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) .. 1424
Sir William Anson .. 1425

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald .. 1426

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 9, at the end, to add the words 'and (c) power to aid by scholarships or bursaries the instruction in public elementary schools of scholars beyond the age or standard of compulsory attendance.'"—(*Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

July 13.]

Page

Dr. Macnamara 1427
Mr. Paul (Northampton) 1429
Mr. Birrell 1430
Sir William Anson 1430

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'beyond the age or standard of compulsory attendance,' and insert the words 'from the age of twelve up to the limit of age fixed for the provision of instruction in a public elementary school fixed by Section 22, subsection (2), of the Education Act, 1902.' "—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed—

"That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

Dr. Macnamara 1431
Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald 1431
Colonel Williams (Dorsetshire, W.) 1431
Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.) 1432

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment," put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted in the proposed Amendment.

Question put, "That the words, as amended, be there added."

Mr. George White 1432
Mr. Rogers (Wiltshire, Devizes) 1432
Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston) 1433
Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.) 1433
Mr. Birrell 1434
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 1434

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 391 ; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 218.)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the CHAIRMAN proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of Clauses 35 and 36.

Question, "That Clause 35, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 36 :—

Question put, "That Clause 36 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 337 ; Noes, 136. (Division List No. 219.)

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Birrell*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again To-morrow.

July 13.] *Page*

Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation) Bill [LORDS] (BY ORDER) —Read a second time, and committed.

LABOURERS' (IRELAND) [ADVANCES].—Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the repayment to the Ireland Development Grant, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of such annual sum as may be advanced out of that fund, in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Law relating to Labourers in Ireland, and to make provision with respect to the application of portion of the Ireland Development Grant."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Captain Craig (*Down, E.*) 1444
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 1445

Question put and agreed to.

CROWN LANDS [RECOVERY OF CROWN RENTS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient that no proceedings shall be taken by or on behalf of the Crown for enforcing the payment of any quit rent or any other perpetual rent payable to the Crown in Ireland, or any arrears thereof, but within sixty years from the time when such rent was last received by or on behalf of the Crown, and that after such period the right of the Crown to the rent and arrears shall be extinguished in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Crown Lands Acts, 1829 to 1894."—(*Mr. McKenna.*)

The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) 1446
Mr. William Rutherford (*Liverpool, West Derby*) 1446

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

Post Office Sites (Re-Committed) Bill.

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 10 agreed to.

Clause 11 :—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 11 stand part of the Bill."

July 13.] Page

Mr. William Rutherford 1447
Sir Frederick Banbury (City of London) 1448
The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 1449
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1450

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time to-morrow.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Amendment proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton) 1452
Mr. McKenna 1452

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

Musical Copyright Bill.

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:—

Mr. Byles (Salford, N.) 1452

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 6, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'which he knows to be pirated.'"—(*Mr. Byles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. Harwood (Bolton) 1453
The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 1454
Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) 1455
Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.) 1455
Mr. Bertram (Hertfordshire, Hitchin) 1458
Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.) 1458
Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire) 1459
Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 1459
Mr. Keir Hardie (Merthyr Tydvil) 1460
The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 1460
Mr. Byles 1460
Mr. O'Hara (Monaghan, N.) 1461
Mr. Lyell (Dorsetshire, E.) 1462

Question put.

Page

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 71 ; Noes, 213. (Division List. No 220.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, leave out the words, 'that he acted innocently,' and to insert the words 'as to any pirated copies that he had taken reasonable steps to ascertain whether the said copies were pirated, and did in fact believe that they were not pirated, and as to any plates that he had taken reasonable steps to ascertain whether the said plates were intended to be used for the purpose of printing or reproducing pirated copies, and did in fact believe that they were not intended for that purpose.' "—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part."

Mr. Lupton 1465
Sir John Walton 1465

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Lupton 1466

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 8 and 9, to leave out from the word 'conviction,' to end of line 9, and to insert the words 'if the prosecution is instituted by an authorised prosecutor.' "—(*Mr. Lupton.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Gladstone 1466

Question, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Question, " That the words 'if the prosecution is instituted by an authorised prosecutor' be there inserted," put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, lines 10 and 11, to leave out the words, 'imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term not exceeding one month, or to.' "—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Mr. Lupton 1467

Amendment proposed—

" In page 1, line 12, to leave out from beginning of line to the word 'Any,' in line 14, and to insert the words, 'not exceeding one pound and two shillings for each copy over ten copies, and five pounds for each plate in respect of which the offence is committed."—(*Mr. Lupton.*)

July 13.] Page

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Lupton 1467

Amendment negatived.

Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) 1468
Mr. J. D. White 1469

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 14, to leave out from the word 'pounds' to end of clause."—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Sir John Walton 1468

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Crean.*)

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 45; Noes, 191. (Division List, No. 221.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, after the word 'who,' to insert the words 'in any street or public place.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

Question put and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 17, after the words last inserted, to insert the word 'knowingly.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question put, "That the word 'knowingly' be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 40; Noes, 190. (Division List No. 222.)

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 17, to leave out the words 'pirated music,' and insert the words 'such copies as aforesaid.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 205 ; Noes, 22. (Division List No. 223.)

Clause 2 :—

Mr. Gladstone 1477

Amendment proposed—

“ In page 1, line 18, to leave out the words ‘ Any constable authorised by an order of,’ and insert the word ‘ if. ’ ”—(*Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*)

Question proposed, “ That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause.”

Mr. O'Hare 1479
Mr. Crean 1479

Question, “ That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause,” put, and negatived.

Proposed word “ if ” inserted.

Amendment proposed—

“ In page 1, line 19, leave out the words from ‘ jurisdiction,’ to ‘ between,’ in line 21, and insert the words ‘ is satisfied by information on oath that there is reasonable ground for suspecting that an offence against this Act is being committed on any premises, the court may grant a search warrant authorising the constable named therein to enter the premises.’ ”—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

“ In page 1, lines 22 and 23, to leave out the words ‘ enter any house or place named in such order.’ ”—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

“ In page 1, line 23, after the word ‘ necessary ’ to insert ‘ to.’ ”—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question proposed, “ That the word ‘ to ’ be there inserted.”

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

“ In page 1, line 25, after the word ‘ otherwise,’ to insert the words ‘ and to seize any copies of any musical work or any plates in respect of which he has reasonable ground for suspecting that an offence against this Act is being committed.”

July 13.] *Page*

(2) All copies of any musical work and plates seized under this section shall be brought before a court of summary jurisdiction, and if proved to be pirated copies or plates intended to be used for the printing or reproduction of pirated copies shall be forfeited and destroyed or otherwise dealt with as the court think fit.' "—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 216 ; Noes, 3. (Division List No. 224.)

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3—

Amendments made.

Mr. T. P. O'Connor 1483

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, at end, to add the words 'provided also that the expressions "pirated copies" and "plates" shall not, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to include perforated music rolls used for playing mechanical instruments, or records used for the production of sound waves, or the matrices or other appliances by which such rolls or records respectively are made.' "—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor.*)

Question put, "That these words be there added."

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4—

Mr. O'Hare 1483
Mr. John Redmond (*Waterford*) 1484
Mr. Crean 1485

Amendment negatived.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Mr. O'Hare 1486

New clause—

"This Act shall not apply to any musical copyright which is not registered in terms of The Copyright Act, 1842, and no proceedings shall be competent in respect of any offence committed prior to such registration."—(*Mr. O'Hara*).

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

Sir John Walton 1486

July 13.] Page

Question put and negatived.

Bill reported ; as amended, to be considered upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 311.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made and Question, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at six minutes after Three o'clock a.m.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOL. CLX.

VOLUME CLX.

ERRATA.

July 4th. Mr. Lloyd-George's Reply to Mr. Armitage.

In Col. 15, *for* lines 42, 43, 44 *read:*

	100 kilogs.	Lire	Cwt.	*s.*	*d.*
Detached parts of machines, other than dynamo-electrical:					
Of sewing machines	,,	30.00	,,	12	2

July 16. Dr. Macnamara's Speech.

In Col. 1398, line 31, *for* "sphere" *read* "survey."

In Col. 1393, line 36, *before* "schools" *insert* "poorer."

In Col. 1405, line 21, *for* "five" *read* "six."

In Col. 1428, line 5, *for* "eliminate" *read* "delimit"; line 6, *for* "elimination" *read* "delimitation"; line 23, *for* "twenty-three" *read* "fifty-three."

July 16. Mr. Hicks-Beach's Speech.

In Col. 1407, line 55, *for* "this was an Amendment" *read* "the Amendment of the Solicitor-General in 1899 was one."

July 16. Mr. A. J. Balfour's Speech.

In Col. 1393, line 3, *for* "North" *read* "West."

In Col. 1394, line 32, *for* "North-West" *read* "West."

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

FIRST SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE SIXTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1906.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 4*th July*, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Kettering Water Bill. Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*) King's Consent signified.)

Bill read the third time and passed.

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation) Bill [Lords]. To be read a second time To-morrow.

Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

London and India Docks and Millwall Dock Companies Bill. [Order March 5th] that the London and India Docks and Millwall Dock Companies Bill be committed, read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.—(*Mr. Caldwell.*)

Sutton District Water Bill. Reported; Report to lie upon the Table.

Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill. Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [July 3rd], "That the Promoters of the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill which has been introduced into this House in the present session of Parliament shall have leave to suspend any further proceedings thereon in order to proceed with the same Bill, if they shall think fit, in the next session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session, and that all fees due thereon up to that period be paid: That the money deposited in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House in respect of such Bill may thereupon be returned to the depositors: That the Promoters of such Bill may, on or before December 31st next, deposit in the Private Bill Office an Estimate, signed by the person making the same, of the expense of the undertaking under the Bill, and, previously to January 15th next, deposit a sum not less than than five per cent. on the amount of such Estimate with the Paymaster-General: That such Bill shall be referred to the Examiners, who shall certify whether or not the Promoters have made such deposit with the Paymaster-General, and, upon the Examiners certifying that such deposit has been made, that the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to all other stages through which the same shall have passed in the present Session and no new fees shall be charged in regard to such stages: That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit in the next session of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto signed by the agent stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present session. That if the money deposited in the present session, as required by Standing Order No. 57, in respect of such Bill has not been withdrawn as provided for by the preceding resolutions a certificate of that fact from the proper officer of the court in which such money was deposited shall accompany such declaration, and such Bill shall not be referred to the Examiners: That such Bill, indorsed by one of the Clerks in the Private Bill Office as having been duly deposited with such declaration and such certificate, if any, annexed, be laid by one of the Clerks of that Office upon the Table of the House in the next session of Parliament: That such Bill, so laid upon the Table, shall be deemed to have been read a first time: That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to such Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present session: That all Petitions presented in the present session against such Bill shall stand referred to the Committee on the Bill in the next session of Parliament, and that all Notices and grounds of objections to the right of Petitioners to be heard, given in the present session within the time prescribed by the Rules of the Referees relating to such Notices, shall be held applicable in the next session of Parliament: That no Petitioners shall be heard before the Committee on such Bill unless their Petition shall have been presented within the time limited in the present session or in respect of which Standing Order No. 128 has been dispensed with in the present session, or unless their Petition shall be presented on or before February 12th, 1907."—(*The Chairman of Ways aud Means.*)

Question again proposed.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said that if he could have an assurance that the passing of this Standing Order would not give this scheme any advantage over its rivals next year, he would withdraw his objection.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS (Mr. EMMOTT, Oldham) replied that he could give that assurance, and the last paragraph of the Motion had been framed so as to ensure that.

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Promoters of the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill which has been introduced into this House in the present session of Parliament shall have leave to suspend any further proceedings thereon in order to proceed with the same Bill, if they shall think fit, in the next session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session and that all fees due thereon up to that period be paid.

That the money deposited in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House in respect of such Bill may thereupon be returned to the depositors.

That the promoters of such Bill may, on or before the 31st day of December next, deposit in the Private Bill Office an estimate, signed by the person making the same, of the expense of the undertaking under the Bill, and, previously to the 15th day of January next, deposit a sum not less than 5 per cent. on the amount of such estimate with the Paymaster-General.

That such Bill shall be referred to the examiners, who shall certify whether or not the promoters have made such deposit with the Paymaster-General, and, upon the examiners certifying that such deposit has been made, that the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to all other stages through which the same shall have passed in the present session, and no new fees shall be charged in regard to such stages.

That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit in the next session of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto signed by the agent stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present session.

That if the money deposited in the present session, as required by Standing Order No. 57, in respect of such Bill has not been withdrawn as provided for by the preceding resolutions a certificate of that fact from the proper officer of the court in which such money was deposited shall accompany such declaration, and such Bill shall not be referred to the Examiners.

That such Bill, indorsed by one of the Clerks in the Private Bill Office as having been duly deposited with such declaration and such certificate, if any, annexed, be laid by one of the Clerks of that Office upon the Table of the House in the next session of Parliament.

That such Bill, so laid upon the Table, shall be deemed to have been read as first time.

That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to such Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present session.

That all Petitions presented in the present session against such Bill shall stand referred to the Committee on the Bill in the next session of Parliament, and that all notices and grounds of objections to the right of Petitioners to be heard, given in the present session within the time prescribed by the Rules of the Referees relating to such Notices, shall be held applicable in the next session of Parliament.

That no Petitioners shall be heard before the Committee on such Bill unless their Petition shall have been presented within the time limited in the present session or in respect of which Standing Order No. 128 has been dispensed with in the present session, or unless their Petition shall be presented on or before the 12th day of February, 1907.

Ordered, That this Order be a Standing Order of the House.

Ordered, That a message be sent to the Lords to acquaint them therewith and desire their concurrence.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against: from Adwell and South Weston; Ancroft; Aston Rowant; Britwell Salome and Britwell Prior; Chinnor; Cuxham and Easington; Ewelme; Lewknor; Pishill; Pyrton; Stoke Talmage, Clare and Wheatfield; Sydenham (Oxford); and Watlington; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING.)

Petitions against alteration of Law: from Abberton; Cartmel; and Darley (two); to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Govan, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

JUVENILE SMOKING BILL.

Petition from Govan, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS.]

Petitions for alteration: from Birkenhead; Doncaster; Hull (two); Lewisham; and West Ham (two); to lie upon the Table.

TRADES UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.

Petition from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

VAGRANT CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from Ulverston, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3663 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COMPANIES (WINDING UP).

Copy presented, of Fifteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 232].

SUPERANNUATIONS.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated June 28th, 1904, declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Keeper of the National Gallery of British Art at Millbank, professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the Public Service are required [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated June 28th, 1906, declaring that Leonardo de Santo, Foreman, His Majesty's Office of Works, Constantinople, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of List of Boroughs and Urban Districts in England and Wales with a population of 5,000 and upwards in which there are no Council Schools [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRAINING COLLEGES FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered March 20th; *Dr. Macnamara*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 233].

DOGS REGULATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1865

Account presented, of the Receipts and Expenditure under the Act for the year 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 234].

FINES, ETC. (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Abstract of Accounts of Fines accounted for by the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks for 1904 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 235].

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Lunacy, Copy of Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the number of patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ending on the 30th June, 1906 [by Act.].

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

"Britannia" Cadets—Instructions in handling Open Boats under Sails, etc.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, considering the fact that no persons already exist to teach the "Britannia" cadets either how to work tides, or board vessels from sailing boats, or how to handle open boats under sail, he would consider the advisability of engaging two watermen to teach the cadets these subjects.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) It is not considered advisable to adopt the course suggested by the hon. Member.

The Hague Conference and Naval Expenditure.

MR. THOMASSON (Leicester): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the impending meeting of a second peace conference at the Hague, and the probable discussion at that conference of the question of the limitation of naval expenditure, in regard to which complete comparative figures are not available, he will take steps to obtain a Return of the naval expenditure of the various Powers that will meet at the Hague, showing the total naval expenditure in each of the last ten years of the various Powers, and their expenditure, in each of the years named, on naval construction.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Admiralty would have no objection to grant a Return of the naval expenditure of the principal maritime Powers, so far as this can be ascertained, if the hon. Member will take the usual steps to move for it.

Evening Delivery of Letters in Caithness-shire.

MR. R. L. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that during the past few years letters were delivered every evening throughout the summer months in the Mill of Mey district, in Caithness, but that now this arrangement has been discontinued, and letters are not delivered until the morning following their arrival at the post office at Scarfskerry, distant about a mile to two miles from the district mentioned; and whether he will give instructions that the letters will in future be delivered in the evening during the summer months in the same way as formerly,

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have called for a Report on this subject, and on its receipt I will communicate with the hon. Member.

Vagrancy—Recommendations of Commission.

MR. BRODIE (Surrey, Reigate): To ask the President of the Local Government Board what steps are being taken to carry into effect the recommendations of the Report of the Departmental Committee on Vagrancy; whether it is possible to carry these recommendations into effect entirely by administrative action; and whether, if legislation is necessary to ensure the adoption of any of the recommendations, such legislation is in contemplation.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am in communication with my right hon. friend the Home Secretary with regard to the recommendations of the Committee. Legislation would be necessary to give effect to some of these recommendations, but it is not intended to propose legislation on the subject during the present session.

Locomotives on Highways.

MR. J. HOPE (Fifeshire, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the increase of the use of motor-cars on the highways, and the fact of the Law allowing these locomotives to proceed with only one man in charge, will he consider the advisability of removing the present restriction which requires a third man to walk or run in front of traction engines, seeing that the cost of this man is a tax on agriculturists when employing these engines for threshing and other purposes.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. The requirement referred to is prescribed by Statute, and consequently could only be altered by legislation. I have caused the point to be noted, but it would not be practicable for the Government to propose legislation on the subject during the present session.

Indian Educational Appointments.

DR. HAZEL (West Bromwich): To ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that the appointments of Mr. E. Candler to the principalship of the Hooghly College in Bengal, and of Mr. W. Horne to an inspectorship of schools in the same province, are temporary ones made during the absence on leave of the permanent holders, will he say what were the educational posts these gentlemen were holding at the time of their appointment to the Indian educational service; what is the length of time during which they have been appointed to act; and who are the permanent incumbents of the posts under Government which they hold.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I understand that, at the time of his appointment to his present post Mr. Candler was tutor in the family of an Indian nobleman, Mr. Horne was tutor to the sons of the Lieutenant-Governor of

Bengal, they had previously held scholastic posts in India and in Scotland respectively. Mr. Candler and Mr. Horne are officiating for Mr. N. L. Hallward and Mr. H. R. James, who have been granted leave, the former for twelve and the latter for eighteen months.

Hours of Labour of Women and Young Persons in Textile Mills—India.

MR. GILL (Bolton): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether any steps are being taken to secure a reduction in the hours of labour of women and young persons in the textile mills in India; and whether he has arranged with the Government of India to invite a British factory inspector to investigate and report on the actual condition of the workers in the mills situated in the Bombay Presidency, as suggested in his reply to a deputation which waited upon him on March 14th last.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The subject of the conditions of labour in Indian mills is at present under inquiry by the local governments. I think it advisable to await the completion of these inquiries, but I do not expect to alter my opinion as to the suggestion referred to.

Executive and Judicial Functions in India.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the recent disturbances at Barisal, if he will state whether he has yet come to a decision as to the advisability of terminating the existing union of executive and judicial functions in the same person; and will he state what steps he proposes to take to ensure the better administration of law in India.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) As I promised in answer to a Question on May 24th,† I have drawn the attention of the Government of India to the subject of the separation of executive and judicial functions, and I propose to await their reply. The hon. Member may rest assured that any measures for improving the administration of the law in India are receiving full consideration, but I cannot at present make any statement on the subject.

Execution in India—Appeals.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state whether the Lieutenant-Governor, by whose orders an Indian prisoner was recently executed, has been censured for giving orders for the sentence to be carried out when sufficient time had not elapsed for an answer to the man's appeal to be received; and will he state whether he proposes to give instructions that no execution of a condemned prisoner is to be effected whilst an answer to an appeal is pending.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I shall be prepared to make a statement regarding this case as soon as I have full information. I am at present in communication with the Government of India on the subject.

Boycott of British Goods in Bengal.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is able to state to what extent the boycott movement in Bengal has affected the importation of British goods; and whether the Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal continues to prohibit in certain districts the singing of the hymn Bande Mataram, or Hail Motherland, and still orders the punishment of school boys for singing the hymn.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The statistics of imports into Bengal show no decline in trade with the United Kingdom, the imports of cotton goods for April, 1906, having been considerably in excess of those for the same months in 1904 and 1905. As to the cry of "Bande Mataram," the intention of the local government is that it should not be prohibited except where it disturbs public worship or would cause such feeling in the Mahomedan population as would be likely to lead to breach of the peace. I am not aware that these instructions have been exceeded.

Vaccination of Recruits for the Swiss Army.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will inform the House whether the compulsory vaccination or re-vaccination of recruits in the Swiss Army was abolished in 1882; and, if so, whether this recognition of conscientious objection in that Army has been followed by any increased susceptibility to small pox among the soldiers.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clvii., 1415.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The compulsory vaccination of recruits in the Swiss Army was abolished in December, 1882. Recruits who desire to be re-vaccinated are allowed to submit to this operation at the public expense. I have no data which would enable me to answer the second part of the Question, but I may point out that the Swiss Army is only called out for eleven days' training in the year, and a comparison of results is therefore rendered very difficult.

Indian Law Students and the Inns of Court Rifle Volunteers.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for War on what grounds Indian law students are prohibited from joining the Inns of Court Volunteers; whether he has sanctioned this restriction; and whether he proposes to take any steps to remove this disability, which affects a considerable class of loyal British subjects.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Indian law students are not prohibited from becoming members of the 14th Middlesex (Inns of Court) Rifle Volunteers, but it has always been the practice in the corps to endeavour to avoid taking recruits who only intend remaining in this country for so short a time as is entailed by their preparation for a call to the English Bar.

Destruction of Army Emergency Rations.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether orders have been issued for the destruction of emergency rations (tinned food) held in the London District Command; and, if so, whether these orders apply to food tinned in this country.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The emergency rations held in the London District have been destroyed, having deteriorated and become unfit for issue. They consisted of cocoa and pemmican and were manufactured for the South service and will not keep in good condition for more than a few years. They were tinned in this country.

Suggested Loan by the Government of Rifles and Morris Tubes to Civilian Rifle Clubs.

CAPTAIN KINCAID SMITH (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he would sanction the loan of a limited number of service rifles free of charge, fitted with Morris tubes, to village rifle clubs showing a reasonable membership and under responsible management.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The loan of rifles and Morris tubes to rifle clubs would involve very large issues, which could not, I regret to say, be met out of the stocks at present in hand.

Salaries of Irish National School Teachers.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the salaries of national school teachers are at present under revision; and, if so, when will the new scale be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The salaries of national school teachers are not at present under revision, but, as I have already stated, the subject is to receive consideration. I cannot make any further statement in the matter at present.

Labour Recruitment in the Lake Province of British Central Africa.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Lake Province of British Central Africa will now be placed upon the same footing as regards labour recruitment as the southern provinces of the protectorate.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Secretary of State is not aware of any reason for removing the safeguards prescribed by ordinance for the employment of labourers from the Lake Province, who require more careful handling than those of the rest of the British Central Africa protectorate; but he is prepared to ask the Commissioner for his views on the subject, if the hon. Member presses the matter.

Italian Import Duties.

MR. ARMITAGE (Leeds, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will give the present duties on machinery and bar iron going into Italy from Germany and the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The following statement gives the particulars asked for. Imports into Italy from Germany and the United Kingdom pay the same rates of duty:—

Tariff Classification.	Tariff rates of duty.		English equivalents.		
		Lire.		*s.*	*d.*
Steam engines, fixed, without boilers	100 kilogs.	12.00	Cwt.	4	10½
Steam engines, semi-fixed, with boilers	”	12.00	”	4	10½
Hot air, compressed air, gas, and petroleum motors and rotary motors	”	12.00	”	4	10½
Boilers:					
Multitubular	”	14.00	”	5	8¼
Others, including boilers of the Galloway system	”	12.00	”	4	10½
Hydraulic, and water or wind motors (turbines, hydraulic wheels, pulsometers, pumps and elevators, presses, accumulators, lifts, hydraulic lifts, &c.)	”	10.00	”	4	0¾
Locomotives, without tenders	”	14.00	”	5	8¼
Traction engines, locomobiles	”	12.00	”	4	10½
Marine machinery	”	12.00	”	4	10½
Haymaking machinery	”	4.00	”	1	7½
Agricultural machinery, other	”	9.00	”	3	8
Spinning machines	”	6.00	”	2	5¼
Machines and looms for weaving	”	6.00	”	2	5¼
Looms for hosiery	”	7.00	”	2	10¼
Machine tools for working wood and metal (saws, planes, lathes, drills, machines for wirework, &c.)	”	9.00	”	3	8
Sewing machines, with or without stands	”	25.00	”	10	2
Knitting machines (manual or power) with or without stands	”	8.00	”	3	3
Machines and apparatus for the manufacture of paper and of paper pulps	”	6.00	”	2	5¼
Milling machines	”	6.00	”	2	5¼
Pumps for liquid manure with galvanised pipes	”	4.00	”	1	7½
Machinery other than dynamo-electrical not especially mentioned	”	10.00	”	4	0¾
Detached parts of machines other than dynamo-electrical	”	30.00	”	12	2
Of sewing machines					
Of other machines:					
Iron or steel parts of the machines mentioned in the footnote,* also cards without card furniture, and Jacquard and ratière mechanism, imported separately	”	10.00	”	4	0¾
Aluminium parts of machines	”	20.00	”	8	1½
Scrapers (doctors) of steel or composition metal for textile printing machines	”	7.00	”	2	10¼
Other parts of machines	”	11.00	”	4	5¾

Tariff classification.	Tariff rates of duty.		English equivalents.		
		Lire.		s.	d.
Apparatus for heating, refining, distilling, &c.	100 kilogs.	18.00	Cwt.	7	7¾
Dynamo-electric machines :					
Weighing up to 1,000 kilogs.	"	25.00	"	10	2
Weighing more than 1,000 kilogs.	"	16.00	"	6	6
Transformers, with or without oil	"	25.00	"	10	2
The undermentioned machines* actuated by dynamos and forming a single entity with them (provided that the motor does not predominate in weight in the entire article) :					
Weighing up to 1,000 kilogs.	"	19.00	"	7	8½
Weighing more than 1,000 kilogs.	"	13.00	"	5	3½
Tension regulators, switches, resistances, interruptors, commutators, controllers, speed regulators, cut-offs, &c. :					
Weighing up to 100 kilogs.	"	30.00	"	12	2
Weighing more than 100 kilogs.	"	25.00	"	10	2
Detached parts of dynamo-electric machines and of transformers :					
Of iron or steel and weighing more than 1,000 kilogs. each	"	16.00	"	6	6
Other	"	25.00	"	10	2
Accumulators and metallic parts thereof	"	16.00	"	6	6
Iron and steel, hammered or rolled in bars of any section, including bars of tempered steel :					
Not having in section any diameter or side of seven millimetres or less	"	6.00	"	2	5¼
Having in section one or more sides or diameters of seven millimetres or less, but exceeding five millimetres	"	7.00	"	2	10¼
Having in section one or more sides or diameters of five millimetres or less	"	9.00	"	3	8

Suggested Reorganisation of the Sanitary and Medical Staff of the Island of Lewis.

Mr. WEIR : To ask the Secretary for Scotland, having regard to the remarks contained on page 56 of the recently issued Report of the Local Government Board for Scotland, relative to the sanitary condition of the Island of Lewis, will he state whether any steps have yet been taken with a view to conform to the Board's suggestion in regard to the reorganisation of the medical and sanitary staff.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The subject is under anxious consideration, but I am unable to make any statement in regard to it at present.

---

* These are : steam engines, fixed, without boiler ; steam engines, semi-fixed, with boiler ; hot air, compressed air, gas, and petroleum motors (including rotary motors), all weighing more than 300 kilogs. ; hydraulic machinery and water motors ; haymaking machinery ; fruit and grape presses ; spinning machinery ; machines and looms for weaving ; hosiery looms ; knitting machines ; refrigerating machines ; aerated water machines ; paper cutting or perforating machines ; brickmaking machines ; pneumatic machines for industrial purposes ; polishing machines ; ventilators with mechanical movements ; machines for bleaching and dyeing ; machines for the manufacture of alimentary pastes ; transmission gearing ; machines and apparatus for the manufacture of paper and paper pulp ; machines for mills ; pumps for liquid manure, with galvanised pipes.

Trunk Telephone Connection between Limerick and Tralee.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he can say whether he will see his way to connect the trunk telephone system between Limerick and Tralee viâ Rathkeale, Newcastle West, Abbeyfeale, and Listowel; and, if so, on what terms will he do so.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Arrangements have been made for the connection of Tralee with the trunk wire system by means of a line to Killarney. It would not be possible to serve by a single trunk line the other towns mentioned in the Question, but I will consider the terms on which a telephone service could be offered, and will communicate with the hon. Member.

Return of Working of the Wireless Telegraph Act.

MR. H. C. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will grant a Return relative to the working of the Wireless Telegraph Act for the twelve months ending December 31st, 1905, and the six months ending June 30th, 1906, respectively, similar to the Return ordered by the House of Commons on July 19th, 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) A Return which will, I hope, afford the information desired by my hon. friend, was presented on June 14th, and will, I understand, be available for distribution to-morrow.

Education Bill—Schools connected with Institutions.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether schools recognised under Clause 38, Part V., of the Education Bills as elementary schools which are part of, or held in premises of, an institution, in which children are boarded will be considered as exempt from those clauses in Part I. which provide for the appointment of teachers and general management by the local education authority, and from those clauses in Part II. which give the local authority power of control over finance.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In reply to the concluding paragraph of the Question, I have to say that Part II. of the Bill will not be proceeded with. In reply to the rest of the Question, the reply is in the affirmative in the case of such schools under the clause as are continued as public elementary schools outside the local authority's control, and in the negative when they are continued as provided schools.

Publication of Education Return.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when the Return dealing with education granted on April 5th, will be ready; and whether seeing that three months have elapsed since it was granted, steps will be taken to have it laid as soon as possible.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am informed that the particulars asked for by the hon. Member have involved extremely difficult problems in the analysis of the educational statistics of of the several Departments concerned, it being impossible by mere extracts from ordinary statistical records to set out with any accuracy the comparisons between the educational figures of the different parts of the United Kingdom which the hon. Member desires. To prevent the Return from being very misleading, almost all the items have had to be subjected to elaborate investigation, in order to make it possible to give them upon anything approaching a true basis of comparison. Efforts are being made to have the Return ready within a fortnight.

Publication of Result of Boy Clerks' Examination.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury when the result will be published of the competitive examination for boy clerks held last May; and can he say on what date the next examination is likely to be held.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I am informed that the result of the boy clerks' examination held on May 15th, will probably be published early next week. The next examination is likely to be held towards the end of September. The exact date will be announced within the next few days.

Motor Traffic—Damage to Property by Dust.

COLONEL WARDE (Kent, Medway): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware of the danger to health, damage to property, and inconvenience to the general public, caused by the disturbance of dust by motor traffic; and whether he will take steps to render this traffic more responsible for this evil.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) As I have stated in answer to previous Questions on this subject, I have received complaints as to the damage and nuisance caused by the dust raised by motor cars, and I have communicated them to the Royal Commission on Motor Cars for their consideration.

National Vaccine Establishment's Stock of Lymph.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the original sources from which the stocks of lymph now used or supplied by the national vaccine establishment were derived; whether obtained in this country or from abroad; and the evidence upon which the genuineness of the vaccine derived from the animal originally yielding the same was established.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I think I must refer my hon. friend to my reply to the Question on this subject which he put to me on June 28th last,† but I may add that no lymph which, on being passed through a series of calves, is productive of appearances differing in any way from those characteristic of vaccinia in the calf is issued from the National Vaccine Establishment.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

His Majesty's Ship "Montagu."

MR. MACLEAN (Bath): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what are the prospects of the battleship "Montagu" now ashore on Lundy Island, being floated; whether the Liverpool Salvage Company is in sole charge of the operations, or are such operations under the direction of the admiral; and, if the latter, will the Admiralty consider the advisability of granting to the salvage company such freedom of action as would be given them in the case of a similar casualty in the mercantile marine.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The prospects of floating the "Montagu" are good if the weather continues favourable. The local operations are under the directions of the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet, and it is not proposed to make any alterations in the existing arrangements at present.

Reclamation of Waste Lands in India.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the rules for the reclamation of waste lands in Assam and the Central Provinces will be amended in accordance with the recommendations of the Famine Commission.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The Government of India state in their recent Resolution regarding land improvements, that after consulting Local Governments they consider the concession suggested by the Famine Commission goes beyond what is needed for any part of India. They are, however, discussing with the Local Governments of Assam and the Central Provinces the expediency of making the waste land rules in these provinces more liberal in certain respects than they now are.

Indian Government Records.

DR. HAZEL (West Bromwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that the appointment of Mr. J. A. Chapman to the principalship of the Calcutta Madrassah is a temporary one, made during the absence on leave of the permanent holder of the office, he will say if Dr. E. Denison Ross, the late principal of the Calcutta Madrassah, has been appointed to the substantive post of officer-in-charge of the records of the Government in India; and if so, who is, at the present moment, the permanent holder of the office of principal of the Calcutta Madrassah.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1116.

MR. MORLEY: Dr. Denison Ross has been appointed to the post of officer in charge of the Records of the Government of India; but he retains, in addition, the principalship of the Madrassah until a permanent successor shall have been appointed.

The Calcutta Madrassah.

DR. HAZEL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, seeing that it has been customary to select a gentleman of distinguished Oriental scholastic attainments for the principalship of the Calcutta Madrassah, and that Mr. J. A. Chapman, the present holder of that office, possesses no such qualifications, but is an ex-clerk in an exchange bank, whose previous educational work has been to lecture on modern English, to commercial classes at the Presidency College in Calcutta, he will say what steps have been, or are being, taken to secure the services of an Oriental scholar for charge, whether temporary or substantive, of the office of principal of the Calcutta Madrassah; and when it is proposed to relieve Mr. Chapman of his duties, and appoint a permanent incumbent possessing the customary and requisite qualifications.

MR. MORLEY: Mr. Chapman is acting for Dr. Denison Ross, who has been deputed to Simla on special duty which was expected to last for about two months, and his acting appointment will presumably terminate when Dr. Ross returns to Calcutta. As I have just stated, Dr. Ross retains for the present the principalship of the Madrassah, and I cannot as yet say when a permanent incumbent will be appointed to succeed him.

Chinese Coolies in South Africa—The Repatriation Notice.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the original draft of the Chinese repatriation notice was a simple statement to the effect that coolies who wished to return to China would be able to do so at the cost of the State; whether this draft was rejected by the High Commissioner; and whether the notice eventually published was submitted to the Chamber of Mines before its approval and publication.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N. W.): The original proposals for a draft were of considerable length and contained a number of detailed restrictions and precautions designed with the express purpose of giving exact effect to the intention of His Majesty's Government—namely, that coolies who earnestly desired to return to China should be enabled to do so, but that no incitement or incentive should be offered which would be likely to provoke a general cessation of work on the mines. Lord Selborne, doubtless after full consultation with all parties concerned, proposed an alternative draft which was accepted by the Secretary of State as being an equal fulfilment of the intentions of the Government and for which we take full responsibility. The vehement opposition offered by the gold-mining industry to the posting of the resulting proclamation, shows how little they were able to forecast its effects and how unfounded is the suggestion that the Chamber of Mines was a consenting party to its publication.

MR. PAUL (Northampton) asked whether these Chinamen could be told they could return home without being threatened in the process.

MR. CHURCHILL: We are considering the question of issuing a new proclamation. As I have already told the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division of Liverpool, I hope to be in a position to give him an answer to-morrow.

SIR H. COTTON: May we expect Papers to be laid at an early date?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir, the Blue-book is far advanced in preparation.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the explanation of the superintendent of Foreign labour in the Transvaal to the effect that the words, tremblingly obey, are a stereotyped formula attached to every single official proclamation issued in China is accepted as satisfactory by His Majesty's Government; whether these words are ordinarily used in prohibitory proclamations only, and that their introduction into the repatriation proclamation was directly calculated to discourge applications for repatriation thereunder; and, if so, what action His Majesty's Government propose to take in regard to the action of the superintendent under whose signature and authority the repatriation proclamation was issued.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Why are the quotation marks omitted by the King's printers? It makes the Question unintelligible.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am told that it is not the custom to permit marks indicating that words are quotations in Questions, though I confess it seems to me it would have been very much simpler in this case if these marks had been used.

MR. CHURCHILL: Lord Elgin is informed by Sir Robert Douglas, of the British Museum, that the phrase "tremblingly obey" is commonly attached to official proclamations, and was originally used to add emphasis to an injunction. It is of such common application, however, that it has ceased to be anything more than a mere form, and it is not by any means confined to prohibitory proclamations.

*MR. REES: May I ask whether the hon. Gentleman is aware that the files of the *Pekin Gazette* afford no support to the ingenious suggestion that the words "tremblingly obey" —[Cries of "Order!"]

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member seems to be about to give some information instead of asking it.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): Seeing that these words "tremblingly obey" are extremely offensive to British ears, will the hon. Gentleman take care that they are not inserted in any proclamation issued in any part of the British Empire?

MR. CHURCHILL: If a new proclamation is issued these words will be omitted.

SIR H. COTTON asked what action the Government proposed to take in regard to the action of the superintendent under whose signature and authority the proclamation was issued.

MR. CHURCHILL: The action of the superintendent with regard to the issue of the proclamation was in every way proper and correct.

*MR. REES: Should I be in order in asking the hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that this expression is used in proclamations such as might be issued by the most virtuous of Governments—for instance by His Majesty's present advisers.

*MR. SPEAKER: The virtue of different Governments is a matter of opinion, and is hardly a subject for a Question.

Transvaal Northern Railway Bonds.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies why the Crown agents for the Colonies have given notice to pay the drawn bonds of the Northern Railways of the Transvaal at ninety-six instead of 100, and what justification there is for such a proposal.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State is advised that ninety-six is a fair payment of their value, having regard to their average price before the war, and it should be remembered that in the Report of the Concessions Commission it was stated that there could be no obligation on the new Government to place the debenture-holders in a better position than they held under the late Government (page 53 of Cd. 623.)

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the bonds of the Pretoria and Johannesburg Railway were paid off at 100? What justification is there for treating these bonds in a different manner?

MR. CHURCHILL: That is only a variation of the original Question; I cannot suggest any convenient variation of my Answer.

Crœsus Mine Manager.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now state what steps have been taken by the Transvaal authorities to bring to justice Withaner, the manager of the compound in the Crœsus Mine, for the admitted flogging of Chinese coolies as alleged in a report made to Lord Selborne by the superintendent of Foreign labour more than two months ago; and whether any reason has been given for the delay on the part of the authorities in taking proceedings in this case.

MR. CHURCHILL: Lord Selborne telegraphed to the Secretary of State on June 30th that the case was in the hands of the Public Prosecutor, Johannesburg, who was issuing a summons for July 2nd, and that the delay had been unavoidable.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) asked whether in mines worked under conditions similar to those in the Transvaal it was possible to get the requisite amount of work out of man without some form of torture.

MR. CHURCHILL: I must ask the hon. Gentleman for notice of that Question.

New Comet Mine—Mr. Thomas Ratcliffe.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Mr. Thomas Ratcliffe, who has taken an affidavit that he saw a Chinaman flogged in a compound since the Order prohibiting flogging was promulgated, was dismissed from his employment on the New Comet mine immediately the fact became known that he had lodged sworn information; and whether the Government propose to take any steps to protect men who report breaches in the law which are committed inside compounds.

MR. CHURCHILL: A telegram has already been sent calling for a report, as I stated in the House in answer to Questions on Thursday and Monday last, and on receipt of the information the Secretary of State will consider whether any action should be taken.

Ceylon Pearl Fisheries.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of of State for the Colonies if he can say how it came about that, in determining what annual rent should be paid for the next twenty years by the private firm leasing the Ceylon Government pearl fisheries, the amount was based on the average net revenue for the previous twenty years, in twelve of which the fishery had failed altogether, although the Governor of Ceylon, in conformity with the opinion of experts, had stated in the dispatch of June 14th, 1905, that with improved and systematic culture there seemed no reason to apprehend a failure of an annual fishery in future years.

MR. CHURCHILL: I presume that the explanation is that improved prospects will depend on the scientific culture on which the company are by the terms of the lease bound to expend from one million to three million rupees in the course of the next twenty years, and which it might be urged since the whole problem of the cultivation and conservation of the pearl oyster on these banks involves a number of any doubtful factors, may or may not prove successful.

MR. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, seeing that the contract with the syndicate who have obtained the concession for the next twenty years of the pearl fisheries in Ceylon was so nearly concluded when the present Government took office that it was not considered possible to reconsider its terms and thus obviate the loss which it entails, will the Government now make such arrangements as will enable them to know with absolute certainty the net yearly profits made by the new limited company, and in that way ensure a more businesslike and adequate return to the Colonial revenue for these fisheries in future.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am of opinion that the published accounts of the Company ought annually to supply the particulars referred to by the hon. Member; and we are addressing them upon this point.

Compulsory Vaccination in Switzerland.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will ascertain and inform the House which of the Cantons constituting the Swiss Republic have abolished compulsory vaccination, and which of them still enforce it; and whether the population of the Cantons in which compulsion has been retained show a liability to smallpox greater or less than the liability shown by the population of the Cantons which have abolished compulsion.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury, for Sir EDWARD GREY): Our latest information (1900) respecting Vaccination Law in Switzerland represents:—

2 Cantons as having never passed such Law.
9 „ „ repealed a former Vaccination Law.
2 „ not enforcing their Vaccination Law.
12 „ having Vaccination Law more or less in force.

Switzerland, in recent years, has not suffered much smallpox; in the period 1900–04 (inclusive) there occurred in this country some 800 cases only of the disease. These cases were fairly evenly distributed between the thirteen Cantons not enforcing, and the twelve cantons giving effect to Vaccination Law. But though the disease may be regarded as fairly evenly distributed in the five years in question over the whole population, it affected very differently children under ten years of age. Of the 800 odd smallpox attacks, 180 were of children under ten; and of these 180 children, twenty-six are recorded as vaccinated, while 154 are returned as unvaccinated. Of the twenty-six vaccinated children taking smallpox, none died; whereas of the 154 recorded as vaccinated and attacked by the disease, twenty-seven died.

Dog Tax Assessors.

MR. SEARS (Cheltenham): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state what was the class and rank of the officers in the Civil Service who were responsible for the assessment of the dog tax prior to 1867, and what was the class and rank of the officers to whom the duties were transferred, which transference led to the increase in the number of dog licences issued from 445,000 to 828,000 in 10 months and to 1,362,000 in 10 years; what steps the Board took in dealing with officers who had been negligent in the discharge of their duties, and can he give a reference to any Parliamentary Paper in which the circumstances are mentioned; is he aware that the Board of Inland Revenue in their twelfth Report stated that the transfer of duties took place under an Act of Parliament passed in March, 1867, and that it was a transfer of duties from parochial to Government officers.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The transfer of 1867 was a transfer from one set of Government officials to another, viz., from Tax officials to Excise officials. I find, however, though I regret the fact was overlooked in my reply to my hon. friend on the 21st ultimo,† that under the Tax officials parochial assessors had been employed, and that their employment ceased on the transfer to the Excise. The Question relates to a past which is now very remote, and the Board of Inland Revenue are not aware of any action taken by their predecessors with reference to any neglect that may have occurred on the part of parochial assessors or collectors, nor can they give a reference to any Parliamentary Paper in which such action is mentioned. But, when the results of the Act of 1867 are cited, it should not be overlooked that, by that Act, the duty on dog licences was reduced from 12s. to 5s., and that the beneficial results that followed may have been due to their reduction quite as much as, or even more than, they were due to the change in the machinery of assessment and collection.

Tax Assessment and Collection.

MR. SEARS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that in 1862–3 influential witnesses, including chairmen of the Board of Inland Revenue, heard before the Horsfall Committee, condemned the system of assessment and collection of taxes by parochial officers; and that the Committee in their Report recommended the Scottish system of employing Government officers, on the ground that it would confer much benefit upon the public, and effect a large saving in the cost of collection; will he say what steps, if any, were taken to give effect to the finding of that Committee; whether the system then condemned is the same as now in use; and, if not, in what respects it differs.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 362.

Mr. ASQUITH: The Horsfall Committee, so far as I ascertain, did not do more than report the evidence taken—not, apparently, being able to agree on any conclusions or recommendations.

Income Tax Collectors.

Mr. SEARS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that both in Scotland and in Ireland the assessors and collectors of income tax, etc., are Government officers, whilst in England parochial officers are employed on the same class of work; will he say if the Acts of Parliament for this purpose are the same for the United Kingdom; and, seeing that the system has been found to work so satisfactorily in Ireland and Scotland, if he will take steps to introduce it into England so as to dispense with clerks to Commissioners, except in their capacity as legal advisers to the Commissioners sitting as a Court of Appeal.

Mr. ASQUITH: The statement in the first part of the Question is not accurate. In Scotland only some of the assessors are Government officers, whilst in Ireland the collectors are almost wholly unestablished employees. The law is not the same for the three parts of the United Kingdom, and the system at present in force in England could not be assimilated either to that of Scotland or to that of Ireland without extensive changes in the law, which the Board of inland revenue cannot recommend.

Inspectors of Mines.

Mr. J. WILLIAMS (Glamorganshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is in a position to make a further statement as to the Inspectorate of Mines for South Wales.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): Yes, Sir; and having consulted my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I think I am now in a position to propose an arrangement which will be satisfactory to hon. Members from South Wales. The special dangers of the South Wales coalfield require a strong inspectorate. It was for that reason that I appointed Mr. Atkinson to the Swansea district. But on account of the representations made to me as to the desirability of having a Welsh-speaking inspector in charge of the Swansea district I have decided perhaps to anticipate a recommendation of the Royal Commission and to strengthen the staff for the whole of South Wales. The Cardift district is already in charge of a Welsh-speaking inspector. Mr. Dyer Lewis, who speaks Welsh, will be appointed as acting inspector in the Swansea district. For the two districts there will be, as now, four assistant-inspectors. Mr. Atkinson will be superintending-inspector for the combined areas. The whole of South Wales will therefore get the benefit of Mr. Atkinson's skill and experience, while nearest to the men there will be the Welsh-speaking inspectors. I hope and believe that this plan will make for increased efficiency in the prevention of accidents. I wish it to be understood that the new arrangement involves no reflection whatever on the zeal and ability of Mr. Gray, the inspector of the Cardiff district.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would favourably consider the desirability of appointing one of these higher superintending inspectors for the coalfield of Lancashire also.

Mr. GLADSTONE replied that the whole question was under the consideration of the Royal Commission, and he was not prepared to answer that Question at this moment.

Lost Property Rewards.

Mr. T. DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware of the inconvenience, trouble, and expense given the recipients of rewards for delivering up lost property found in public vehicles, etc., by compelling the finders to attend personally or by proxy, at New Scotland Yard, to receive the reward; and whether he will consider the possibility of sending the amount by postal order to the address of the finder, or that it might be handed to him at any police station by request.

Mr. GLADSTONE: It is not the case that finders are compelled to attend personally or by proxy at New Scotland Yard to receive their rewards; these rewards are always sent by post when the finder so desires.

Swiss Post Office Officials and Vaccination.

MR. LUPTON : I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the conscientious objections of post office officials are respected in Switzerland; and, if the reply be in the affirmative, whether they have shown any special liability to smallpox in consequence of their exemption from vaccination.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) : I am not aware what is the practice in Switzerland in regard to the vaccination of post office officials, nor have I any information in regard to the experience regarding the results of that practice.

MR. LUPTON : Will the right hon. Gentleman ascertain if it be not the fact that the death-rate from smallpox in Switzerland is as high in districts where vaccination is compulsory as it is in those where it is not compulsory ?

MR. T. M. HEALY : Is it fair to Switzerland thus to brand it with smallpox ?

[No Answer was returned.]

British Mails on German Boats.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway) : I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will state the total amount paid by His Majesty's Government to the German Government during the last fiscal year for the carriage by steamers of German lines of His Majesty's mails to the United States.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON : The amount paid for the period in question was £1,550; but as the payments are based on periodical statistics the sum represents the correspondence which was specially addressed to be sent by German steamer when the last statistics were taken. Fresh statistics will be taken next year, and it is impossible at present to say what sum will then be payable.

Wireless Telegraphy.

MR. BEAUCHAMP (Suffolk, Lowestoft) : I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any licences for the establishment of wireless telegraph stations have been granted to the Corporation of Lloyds.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON : Licences have been promised to the Corporation of Lloyds for a number of stations, and will be issued very shortly. Their settlement has been delayed by difficult questions arising out of the relations between Lloyds and the Marconi Company. In connection with the matter, I take the opportunity of making an explanation. On the Post Office Estimates the other day, I thought it my duty strongly to comment on some circulars issued by the secretary of Lloyds in regard to this matter.† Since then I have received communications from the secretary stating that the circulars in question were issued in good faith. This assurance I, of course, accept, and am glad to withdraw any words which might imply the contrary.

Toxteth Relieving Officer.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) : I beg to ask the President to the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the recent appointment of a relieving officer by the Toxteth guardians, who advertised, about the 18th May, for applications, stating that candidates must not be more than forty years of age ; that notwithstanding that there were many candidates with experience of the duties and complying with the age limit, the guardians have appointed the secretary of the Claremont Liberal Club, a man forty-one and a half years of age and without any previous experience; and whether he proposes to sanction this appointment.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury.) : My right hon. friend has received some representations with regard to this appointment and has asked for the observations of the guardians on the subject. These he expects shortly to receive.

Poplar Inquiry.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY : I beg to ask the President to the Local Government Board whether he will have the shorthand notes which he is having taken of the proceedings of the Poplar Inquiry printed and circulated as a Parliamentary Paper at the close of the inquiry.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 389.

MR. RUNCIMAN: As my right hon. friend has previously stated, he proposes to defer the consideration of this Question until the Inquiry is completed.

Poplar Receiving House for Children.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the total cost to date of the receiving house for children at 54, East India Dock Road, Poplar; and also the total cost to date of the poor law schools of the Poplar union at Hutton, Essex.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The total expenditure sanctioned in respect of the receiving home is £14,210, and in respect of the schools £156,545. I am not able to state the precise amounts which have been spent on them.

Belmont Imbecile Asylum, Sutton.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to the outbreak of enteric fever at the Belmont Imbecile Asylum, Sutton; whether any delay arose in notifying the disease to the local sanitary authority; and whether the cause of the infection has been discovered.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am aware of the outbreak referred to. There was some delay in the notification to the sanitary authority. This was due to the fact that many of the cases, especially the earlier ones, presented peculiar symptoms, and that it was not until bacteriological tests had been applied that a diagnosis of enteric fever was arrived at.

Vaccination of Teachers.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he can state whether teachers in Government schools in Switzerland have their conscientious objections to vaccination respected; and, if it be in the affirmative, whether this abolition of compulsory vaccination and re-vaccination has been followed by these officials showing any special liability to small-pox.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): I have no information on the subject.

MR. LUPTON: Will you make inquiry?

MR. LOUGH: I will see if inquiries can be made.

Treasury Grant to Welsh Intermediate Schools.

MR. GIBBS (Bristol, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what is the total amount of Treasury grant paid to Welsh intermediate schools under Section 9 of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889, in the last complete year; and what is the total amount of grant paid to those schools under the secondary school regulations in the same period.

MR. LOUGH: The figures are as follows:—The total amount of grant paid under Section 9 of the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889, in respect of the year ending June 30th, 1905, was £22,281 3s. 7d. The total amount paid under the Regulations for Secondary Schools for the same year was £16,102 17s. 0d.

Dipton Catholic School.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the proceedings at the inquiry into the proposal to build a Catholic school at Dipton, Durham; whether he is aware that the clerk to the Durham County Council wrote a letter stating that the existing Catholic school would only be recognised for 365 scholars, although the secretary of the Durham education authority wrote that there were 507 places; whether the local education authority now seeks to compel the Catholic children to accept board school teaching; and whether he can state if the Durham County Council brought down a member of the Parliamentary bar to oppose the granting of educational facilities to Catholics in a new school which they are willing to build at their own cost; and, if so, what fee he received, and by whom will it have to be paid.

Mr. LOUGH: I have not yet received the Report of the Commissioner appointed to hold the inquiry, which, indeed, only took place a few days ago. Until that Report has been received and carefully considered I must decline to answer any of the Questions put to me by the hon. Member on the subject matter of the inquiry.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Has the attention of the hon. Gentleman been directed to a speech by the chairman of this body in which he said he would not rest satisfied as long as there was one denominational school in the district.

Mr. LOUGH: No, Sir.

Mr. DILLON: I will send the hon. Gentleman a report of the speech.

Government Abstractors' Pension.

Mr. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the compulsory retirements at the War Office and General Post Office of abstractors, after over thirty years service, on pensions of about 12s. or 13s. per week, he will take steps to revise the rules which compel abstractors to deduct, when reckoning their service for pension, half their unestablished service which merged into permanent service, so as to put them on a similar footing to those who entered the service under precisely the same regulations as to pension, and who are allowed to count the whole of their temporary service towards superannuation.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.): I regret that I can add nothing to the Answers which have been repeatedly given by myself and my predecessors on this subject. In particular I would refer the hon. Member to the replies which I gave to Questions by the hon. Members for Woolwich and Blackburn on March 26th and May 17th last respectively. †

The Mall.

Mr. T. DAVIES: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he can inform the House when he expects the work of extending the Mall completed; and whether it is his intention to demolish any more of the buildings in Spring Gardens in order to have a wider and a more imposing entrance from Charing Cross.

The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale): The new Admiralty building at the end of the Mall is expected to be completed by the end of 1908. The buildings in Spring Gardens referred to are not the property of His Majesty's Government and I am not aware of any proposal to demolish them, but if this is suggested it would seem to be in the nature of a Metropolitan improvement and as such is a matter for the London County Council.

Land Registration in Scotland.

Mr. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether any steps have been taken to carry out one of the recommendations of the Committee appointed in 1897 to inquire into the present system of land registration in Scotland, viz., that the substitution of a photo-zincographic for a written record should, under appropriate regulations and safeguards, be sanctioned.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire): No such steps have been taken hitherto. The substitution of a photo-zincographic for a written record cannot be carried out except by legislation, which is not at present possible.

Lewis—Local Taxation.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has yet received the Report on the incidence of local taxation in the Island of Lewis; and, if so, can he state when it will be laid upon the Table of the House.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Report has been received and will be issued as soon as possible. I am not in a position to name a date.

Mr. WEIR: Is the Report in the hands of the printers yet?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I will ascertain.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliv., 839; clvii., 654.

Mr. WEIR: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that it is not kept back purposely ?

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is no such intention.

Mr. WEIR: It was so last year.

Medical Statistics for the Island of Lewis.

Mr. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state when the Report of the medical inspector of the Local Government Board concerning the statistical *data* of the Island of Lewis for ten years 1895 to 1904, inclusive, will be presented to Parliament.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Report to which my hon. friend refers does not add materially to the information already furnished, and under these circumstances it is not intended to present it to Parliament at present.

Mr. WEIR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this Report would be of the greatest service to me ?

Evicted Tenants and Untenanted Lands.

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the need of land for evicted tenants and other persons, and the danger that if untenanted land be not acquired now for these purposes it may pass permanently into the hands of graziers, whether all rural district councils will be furnished with copies of the forthcoming Return of untenanted land; and whether all purchase inspectors will be instructed to visit and report upon all land of this class in the counties in which they work.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.): I have already informed the hon. Member that it is not proposed to distribute the Return gratuitously to local authorities, and I have also stated the course which the Estates Commissioners intend to adopt. I refer to my Answers to the hon. Member's Questions of 21st and 28th May.† The Commissioners propose in the first instance to ascertain from the owners of untenanted land which appears suitable for distribution whether they are prepared to sell to the Commissioners, and if the owners should express their willingness to sell, the Commissioners will have the lands inspected, and will intimate to the owners the prices they are prepared to give.

Mr. GINNELL: Will the Commissioners inquire into uneconomic holdings and untenanted lands in all parts of Ireland ?

Mr. BRYCE: It is intended that the term of reference shall cover Ireland generally. The inquiry will not be restricted to the congested districts.

Irish Emigration—The Labourers Bill.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has noticed that the present increase in the numbers emigrating from Ireland comes mainly from the rural population, and is due to want of land, while large tracts are untenanted; will the Government give favourable consideration to Amendments of the Labourers Bill designed to break in upon those tracts; and will a serious effort be made next session to make those tracts available for popular use.

Mr. BRYCE: The Registrar-General informs me that he believes the hon. Member to be correct in assuming that the increase in the number of emigrants from Ireland in April and May came mainly from the rural population. The bulk of emigration ordinarily comes from the rural classes, and fluctuations from varying causes, including no doubt the want of land, are not unusual. There was, for instance, a considerable decrease in the month of March. I have already announced that it is the intention of the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the problem of congestion in Ireland. That inquiry will not be confined to the western part of the country. The question of untenanted land does not appear to arise directly upon the Labourers Bill, but so far as any Amendments to that Bill are in order they will be fairly considered.

Dromahane Evicted Tenant.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clvii., 948; clviii., 81, 88.

Commissioners have received an application in respect to the holding of Mrs. O'Regan, widow, Dromahane, Mallow, from which she was recently evicted, and which is now in the possession of Mr. T. Mullane, national teacher; and, if so, what steps have been taken in regard to the reinstatement of this evicted tenant.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners have received from Mrs. O'Regan an application for reinstatement, and have referred it to one of their inspectors for inquiry in due course.

Mr. Templemary's Buttevant Estate.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received any information in regard to the estate of Mr. Richard Fuge Templemary, Buttevant, county Cork; and whether, in view of the fact that eight tenants have been evicted on this property, and their holdings are now in the landlord's possession and used as a grazing ranch, the Commissioners will send an inspector to the district with a view to the purchase of this property and the reinstatement of evicted tenants.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners have received five applications for reinstatement on this estate. Three of these are already in the hands of the local inspector for inquiry, and the two remaining cases will be referred to him.

Work of the Irish Department of Agriculture.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has noticed that the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction has already cost, out of moneys voted by Parliament, more than £1,000,000, plus £252,639 contributed by local bodies; that in the six years since the Department was founded the area under grass, including meadow and clover, has increased, the area waste or half-cultivated has increased, and the area under tillage crops diminished; that emigration continues and now includes, in addition to agricultural workers, many on whose technical and scientific training public money has been expended; and if the committee of inquiry, now sitting, will investigate the methods which have produced these results, with a view to suggesting a remedy.

MR. BRYCE: The sums which have been voted by Parliament to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction amount to £1,000,893. This sum, however, includes the cost of the various departments and institutions which were transferred by statute to the Department, including the Fisheries Office, the Veterinary Department, the Royal College of Science, the Science and Art Museum, the National Library, the Metropolitan School of Art, and the Royal Botanic Gardens. It also includes the Science and Art grants formerly administered from South Kensington, and grants in aid of the Congested Districts Board amounting to £160,000. The contributions of local bodies are not grants received by the Department, but are amounts levied by local authorities from the rates to be expended locally upon schemes subsidised by the Department. It is the fact that since the Department was founded the area under crops has decreased, and that the area under grass, including meadow and clover, has increased; but it is not the case that the area of waste land has increased. I am informed that the increase in pasture since 1900 has been much less marked than in the preceding years. Emigration no doubt continues, but I have no information that persons are emigrating on whose technical and scientific training public money has been expended. The terms of reference to the committee include an inquiry into the Department's funds and the modes of employing them.

MR. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware how much of the £1,000,000—a considerable proportion—has been expended on the clerical and other staffs.

MR. BRYCE: I cannot say.

The Robert Tyndall Estate, County Kilkenny.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants of the Robert Tyndall estate, Kilmacow, county Kilkenny, were negotiating for purchase and that the best offer which the landlord would make was 26·6 years purchase of present rents; whether the Estates Commissioners will consent to act as arbitrators between landlord and tenants, if requested by the tenants; whether he is aware that, on the failure of negotiations for sale, the landlord took steps to enforce immediate payment of present rents, and obtained from the courts writs for seizure, and whether he will take such steps as will safeguard these tenants from further proceedings of this nature?

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that no proceedings for the sale of the estate referred to have yet been instituted before them, and they have not been asked by any of the persons concerned to intervene as conciliators in pursuance of the regulations. If such a request should be made by the tenants, and they should be furnished with particulars of the estate, they will be prepared to consider whether this is a case in which their intervention would be likely to lead to an amicable settlement.

Congested Districts Board's Records.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board keep a record, in tabulated form, by counties, of the area and valuation of the lands purchased by them, and the price paid for each property, showing the amount paid for occupation interest, and the amount paid for fee-simple, together with the sum expended on dwelling-houses, farm buildings, drainage, fencing, striping, or other improvements on these lands, the area and annuity of each allotted plot, with the name of the landlord and occupier from whom purchased; whether a tabulated record by counties is kept of the area and valuation of lands which they have offered to purchase, but were unable to buy, together with the price demanded and the price refused, showing amount offered for fee-simple and amount offered for occupation interest, together with the name of the landlord and occupier in each case; and whether a similar record is kept by the Estates Commissioners; if not, will instructions be given to these Government Departments to keep such records for the information of Parliament.

MR. BRYCE: The Congested Districts Board keep for their own purposes records of all the matters referred to in the Question, but they always treat as confidential their negotiations for purchase in cases where no agreement is arrived at. The prices offered in these cases are duly recorded. The price offered is for the fee-simple. No offer is made for occupation interest. Detailed information as to the estates purchased is given in the Board's annual reports. The Estates Commissioners keep records of all estates purchased by them under the Irish Land Act, 1903, and from these records are compiled the elaborate statements in tabular form appended to their annual reports. The particulars recorded comprise, by counties, the area and price of estates purchased by them, and the valuation when known. No price is paid by the Commissioners for occupation interest. Full particulars are also kept of the sums expended on improvements; also of the area and annuity of the plots allotted, and the name of the landlord and purchaser. The Commissioners also keep a record of the area of, and price offered for, all estates as to which their offer has been refused by the owner, but the negotiations in cases of this kind are regarded as confidential and the details cannot be published. The price offered is in all cases for the fee-simple interest; the Commissioners do not make advances for the purchase of tenants' occupation interest. In addition to the information given in the annual report, monthly returns are now being presented to Parliament, which give, in tabular form, by estates, the name of each purchaser of a holding, the townland, area, valuation, rent, tenure, price, amount of advance, and date of advance.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): Will this information which the right hon. Gentleman says is confidential be at the disposal of the Commission about to be appointed?

MR. BRYCE: I should say it would, but it would be treated as confidential, I imagine. That, however, is a matter for the Commission itself.

MR. KILBRIDE: Would it not be important for the Commissioners to have particulars of the offers made by unreasonable and unconciliatory landords in Ireland?

MR. BRYCE: There is no reason why the Commission should not have at its disposal every kind of information it requires.

Mr. Leader's Banteer (Cork) Estate.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to the sale of the estate of Mr. W. Leader, Dromagh, Banteer, county Cork, for which the originating application was lodged in June, 1905, whether the Estates Commissioners have yet succeeded in procuring the reinstatement and resettlement of the evicted tenants, Denis Fitzpatrick and Mrs. Cronin; whether the landlord has yet made any offer to the Commissioners of the sale of any portion of the untenanted land in his possession, with a view to settling other deserving evicted tenants of the locality on economic holdings, and the applotment of land amongst the labourers of the locality; and, if so, what action has been taken by the Commissioners.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have now received their inspector's report upon the applications of the two persons mentioned, and will consider it in due course. The estate, for the sale of which proceedings have been instituted, comprises, in addition to tenanted land, 1,080 acres of untenanted land which the vendor proposes to sell to the Commissioners, and of which he proposes to repurchase 880 acres. The Commissioners have not yet ruled on the application.

Kilkeary Lands, Kilkenny.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Irish Land Commission are landlords of certain lands of Kilkeary, in the county of Kilkenny, held by fifteen tenants; that up to 1893 these lands were held from the Irish Land Commission by middlemen; that in consequence of the non-payment of rent by these middlemen they were ejected by the Land Commission in 1893; that a representative of the Land Commission then induced some of the occupying tenants to sign agreements to become tenants to the Land Commission at a rent which was nearly three times the rent previously payable to the Land Commission by the middlemen; that these tenants got an undertaking from the representative of the Irish Land Commission, before signing such agreements, that the Land Commission would sell to them under the Land Purchase Acts at sixteen-and-a-half years purchase of the rent so agreed on, and that the purchase agreements would be sent to them for signature; and will he say why this arrangement has not hitherto been carried out, and whether the Land Commission will now have effect given to it.

MR. BRYCE: I have not yet received from the Land Commission the necessary information to enable me to reply to this Question. The subject appears to be one of some complexity, and doubtless the Commissioners find it necessary to make detailed inquiries. I would ask the hon. Member to defer the Question for a few days.

Congested Districts Boards Land Purchases.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board paid for lands purchased by them, fifteen years purchase of first-term rents in 1902 and eighteen years purchase in 1906, and of second term rents eighteen and three-quarter years purchase in 1902, and twenty-one and a quarter years purchase in 1906; and, if so, can the Board explain, in view of the depression in agricultural values, how the increase of three years purchase and two-and-a-half years respectively can be explained.

MR. BRYCE: The facts are as stated by the hon. Member. The Question put will be mentioned to the Board at its next meeting, which will be in a few days. I have not the materials at present for a fuller answer.

Cork Agricultural Schemes.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that for the purposes of schemes under The Agricultural and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899, the Cork County Council has contributed out of the rates, during the five years ended 31st March, 1906, the sum of £21,110, and Cork County Borough, for the same period, the sum of £4,335; whether he can say what specific schemes for the improvement of agriculture have been carried out in the county by the Department during that period, and what schemes for technical instruction in the county borough; and whether, having regard to the large sums contributed by the county and in view of the evidence given before the Butter Committee of this House by butter experts in respect to the dairy industry in Denmark, Canada, and the Australian Colonies, the Department are prepared to take practical steps towards the establishment of winter dairying in Ireland.

MR. BRYCE: The facts are correctly stated in the first paragraph of the Question. The agricultural schemes which have been put into operation in the county are those relating to—Live Stock Improvement; Poultry Improvement; Instruction in Horticulture and Bee Keeping; Instruction in Home Dairying; Subsidies to Agricultural Shows; Instruction in Agriculture, including winter classes; and the scheme of prizes for cottages and small farms. The Technical Instruction Scheme in operation in the county borough includes instruction in some fifty subjects of Science, Art, Technology, Commerce, Domestic Economy, Lace and Crochet Making, and Art Needlework. As regards winter dairying in Ireland, a few of the County Committees of Agriculture have recently discussed the question; and the Department are prepared to do whatever they legitimately can do towards encouraging this industry.

Irish Land Prices—Holdings Within the Zones.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to tha Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, since the large class of holdings within the zones are not inspected on a sale, what ground is there for his hope that, on a reversal of the decision in King-Harman and Hayes, the consequential adjustments of price and bonus in completed transactions could be made; and will the Lord-Lieutenant, in exercise of his powers under the Land Act of 1903, require the Estates Commissioners to obtain and record, irrespective of zones, the information necessary for this purpose.

MR. BRYCE: In the case of holdings within the zones, the prices agreed on are presumed to be equitable, consequently the question raised in the case of Hayes *v.* King-Harman could not, under the terms of the Act of 1903, be applied to such cases. The reversal of the decision in that case would not, therefore, affect zone cases. The Lord-Lieutenant does not propose to require the Estates Commissioners to take a form of action which was not contemplated by Parliament.

Irish Returns.

COLONEL M'CALMONT (Antrim, E.); I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland who provided the information contained in Return No. 173, presented to Parliament in 1903, and is it not customary when preparing such Returns to apply for information on the subject to the owner of the property or his representative.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the Inspector General that the information embodied in the Return referred to was obtained by the police from the best available sources. Unless the facts were within the knowledge of the police themselves, they usually applied to the landlord or his representative, and when the facts could not be ascertained in this way they sought information from the evicted tenant.

COLONEL McCALMONT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the agent of this estate never knew of the existence of this Return till a fortnight ago when a Question was put on it to the right hon. Gentleman, and does he know that the agent declares the Return to be both misleading and inaccurate?

MR. BRYCE: I do not see how I can know what is in the agent's mind, but if he will convey his views to those who compiled the Return no doubt they will be taken notice of.

Bruff Evicted Tenants.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that about the end of the year 1880, on the expiration of the leases of Catherine Walsh and James Toomey, both of North Camas, Bruff, co. Limerick, the landlord, Dr. Samuel Russell, Army surgeon, evicted them from their farms, on which they had expended considerable sums of money in draining, fencing, and levelling, portions of which were cut out bog; is he aware that the landlord's plea for so doing was his alleged desire of farming the lands for himself; that, under a promise of restoring them at no distant date, he induced them to take a small amount of compensation, but afterwards gave the farms in question to a planter named Paul Rourke; is he aware that Rourke is only an eleven months' tenant; and will he say whether the Estates Commissioners have received applications for reinstatement from those evicted tenants, and will they send an inspector to make inquiry on the subject.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received from the persons named applications for reinstatement in evicted farms now in the occupation of a msn named Rourke. The cases will be inquired into by the local inspector in due course, but in the meantime the Commissioners have no knowledge of the facts.

The Royal Canal.

MR. J. P FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the state of the Royal Canal between Longford and Mullingar; how long it is since a dredger was used on this portion of the canal; and will he use his influence to get the owners to put the canal into a workable condition.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the Board of Control that on May 24th, when their officer last inspected the Royal Canal between Longford and Mullingar, a dredger was being used there. The Board are aware that dredging operations have been steadily proceeding on this portion of the canal for the past four years.

Irish Consultative Committee of Education.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that of the five members constituting the Consultative Committee of Education, three represent the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, while the National Board and the Intermediate Board have only one representative each upon the Committee; and whether, in order to stimulate greater interest in the work of the Committee, he will propose a revision of its constitution, so as to make it more truly representative of all branches of education in Ireland.

MR. BRYCE: Under the 23rd section of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Act, 1899, the Consultative Committee of Education is to consist of five members, namely, the Vice-President of the Department, and one member to be appointed by each of the following Boards:—National Education Board, Intermediate Education Board, Agricultural Board, and Board of Technical Instruction. No change in the method of constituting the Committee could be effected without legislation.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Do the Committee ever meet?

MR. BRYCE: Yes, they met very recently and drew up a confidential report.

Treasury Grants for Irish School Buildings.

MR LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether representations have been made to him recently by the Commissioners of National Education pressing for the restoration of Treasury grants for building new schools in Ireland, and for the repair and equipment of school buildings; and whether he is able to state the result of his negotiations with the Treasury in reference to this matter.

MR. BRYCE: Correspondence upon this subject has for some time been passing between the Irish Government, the Commissioners of National Education, and the Treasury. It would, however, be contrary to usage to state the details of the correspondence. A definite conclusion has not yet been arrived at, but the Irish Government are doing all that may be possible to bring about a prompt settlement of the question, the importance of which is fully recognised.

Ballinamore Rate Collector.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the appointment by the Leitrim County Council of Mr. P. Curran as rate collector of the divisions of Ballinamore has been sanctioned by the Local Government Board; whether he is aware that, at the last meeting of the county council, the chairman refused to submit a motion, of which due notice had been given, to rescind the appointment of Mr. Curran and to accept instead the tender of Mr. James Kelly, who offered to do the collecting at a commission of two pence in the pound, against sixpence in the pound to be paid to Mr. Curran; and whether the chairman was entitled to refuse to put this motion to the meeting.

MR. BRYCE: The Local Government Board have sanctioned the appointment of Mr. Curran. The Board understand that the chairman of the county council, on the advice of the solicitor to the council, refused to put the motion for rescinding Mr. Curran's appointment, and in the Board's opinion the chairman acted within his powers, seeing that the appointment had already been sanctioned by the Board.

Clogher Council and the Labourers Bill.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a resolution passed by the Clogher Rural District Council, and endorsed by other public bodies, urging that Clause 18 of the Labourers Bill should be omitted or amended, and proposing that farmers should be enabled to borrow money on easy terms for the purpose of improving and erecting labourers' cottages on their farms; and whether he will consider the desirability of proposing such amendments of the Labourers Bill as will meet the wishes of a considerable body of public opinion in Ireland.

MR. BRYCE: The Local Government Board have received the resolution in question, the purport of which is that the amount available for the erection of labourers' cottages by district councils should be devoted to the purpose of enabling occupiers of farms to borrow money on easy terms for the improvement of their own dwellings and outhouses as well as for the erection and improvement of labourers' cottages on their own farms. The question of improving farmers' houses is entirely outside the scope of the Labourers Bill, and the suggestion as to making loans to farmers for the erection or improvement of labourers' cottages on their own holdings is not one which commends itself to the Government. In such case the important consideration that the loans should be secured by the rates would be entirely absent. I have no information that there is a considerable body of public opinion in Ireland in favour of the proposals mentioned.

MR. KILBRIDE asked if the fundamental policy of the Labourers Act passed by Parliament, had not been to make the Irish labourer as independent of the farmer as the farmer had been made independent of the landlord?

MR. BRYCE: No doubt that is so.

Woodford Branch of the United Irish League.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he received a series of resolutions passed at a public meeting organised by the United Irish League at Woodford, county Galway, on May 13th, which contained incitements to boycotting and intimidation; whether a police shorthand writer was present at the meeting; and whether his notes of the speech of the Rev. P. M'Loughlin, who presided, have been submitted to the law officers of the Crown, with a view to legal proceedings being taken.

MR. BRYCE: I have received a newspaper report containing resolutions which purport to have been passed at the meeting referred to. I am informed that no police shorthand writer was present at the meeting, and that no occasion arose for consulting the law officers of the Crown.

Head Constable Spence, Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a report of the inquiry, held at Abbeyleix, Queen's County, during the week ending May 26th, into the truth or otherwise of certain allegations, made by the hon. Member for the Leix Division, against Head Constable Spence; and whether he will communicate to the House the nature of the charges, and the results of the investigation.

MR. BRYCE: An inquiry was held in reference to certain allegations regarding the conduct of Head-Constable Spence, and the result was to exonerate the Head Constable.

Woodford Dog Licence Prosecution.

MR. JOHN ROCHE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the policeman who charged James McMahon at the Woodford, county Galway, petty sessions, on May 14th, with having an unlicensed dog in his possession, admitted in court that he did not see any dog with McMahon, and did not say he knew he had a dog; and whether, seeing that in face of that admission, McMahon was fined 2s. and costs for having an unlicensed dog in his possession, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

MR. BRYCE: I beg to refer the hon. Member to the replies which I gave on May 28th and June 27th† to his previous Questions on this subject. The sufficiency of the evidence is, as I have already stated, a matter for the magistrates, and I should be setting a formidable precedent were I to attempt to review their decision by entering into the details of the case.

MR. KILBRIDE: Has this dog ever been found dead or alive?

MR. BRYCE: I will inquire if the hon. Member wishes.

Irish Lunacy Grants.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution adopted at a special meeting of the committee of management of the Cork District Lunatic Asylum on June 28th protesting against the proposed change in the Act 1 Edw. 7, c. 17; whether he is aware that this change would result in a loss to the Cork District Lunatic Asylum of from £500 to £600 per annum, and would throw back as paupers many men who have served their country in the Army and Navy; and whether, if the Act be changed, steps will be taken to secure that the ordinary criminal lunatic be paid for on the same scale in Ireland as in England, viz., 14s. per week, this arrangement to have retrospective effect back to the date of the passing of the Act of 1884 for England.

MR. BRYCE: I have received the resolution referred to, and I understand the prospective loss to the Cork District lunatic asylum, will be approximately as stated. I am informed that the payments made during the last three years to Lunatic Asylums in Ireland in respect of lunatic soldiers and sailors who are not criminals, amount in all to about £3,500 a year, which would not have been paid but for the verbal error in the Act of 1901. As regards the concluding paragraph of the Question, I may state that in Ireland the gross average cost is paid by the Government for criminal lunatics, and therefore if the amount were increased as suggested the asylums would receive for the maintenance of criminal lunatics more than their actual cost. I understand that the cost of maintenance is higher in English than in Irish asylums.

MR. T. M. HEALY asked why the Irish Government did not deal with this matter instead of leaving it to the Treasury.

MR. BRYCE replied that it was a matter of departmental courtesy and etiquette. It would require more time than was afforded by the limits of an Answer to a Question to explain the relations between the two Departments.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: But something ought to be done to remedy this injustice.

MR. BRYCE: It does not appear from the answer supplied to me that there is an injustice.

MR. FLYNN: Did any public body in Ireland ask for this alteration?

MR. BRYCE: I cannot say.

Knockaderry Evicted Tenant.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that J. Scanlan, of Kilgullinan, Knockaderry, in the county of Limerick, was evicted from his holding in the year 1887, which contains thirty-one-and-a-half acres, held by him at the yearly rent of £63 10s., valuation £44; that since the eviction he died, leaving his widow, Kate Scanlan, and family surviving; that the evicted farm is in the landlord's (Major B. Sheehy's) hands; and whether under these circumstances, he will say if the Estates Commissioners will approach the landlord with the view of settling this case and reinstating Mrs. Scanlan.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 83 (Mr. Reddy); clix., 951.

Mr. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners have no knowledge of the facts of this case. They have received from Mrs. Kate Scanlan an application for reinstatement, and have approached the owner with a view to effecting a settlement, but have not yet received a reply from him. The local inspector will make further enquiries in due course.

Limerick Evicted Tenants.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the Estates Commissioners have yet sent an inspector to the county of Limerick to inquire into the cases of evicted tenants there; and, if they have not, will he explain the cause of delay.

Mr. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the inspector appointed to inquire into and report on the applications of evicted tenants from the counties Clare and Limerick is at present engaged on the Clare cases. He will in due course take up his enquiries into the Limerick cases. There are only a limited number of inspectors, and it has been necessary to allot more than one county to each.

Irish Land Appeals.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any of the Sub-Commissioners, whose term of office expired, gave evidence on behalf of the landlords before Mr. Justice Fitzgerald at Limerick last week, in the rehearing of cases appealed by the tenants from the Sub-Commission Court; and, if so, whether their valuation was higher than the rents fixed by the Sub-Commissioners; and whether, when these ex Sub-Commissioners were appointed, he can say if it was on the ground of competency in being able to determine the value of land.

Mr. BRYCE: I am informed by the Land Commission that the cases referred to in the Question are still pending, the decision of the Court not having yet been pronounced. The Judicial Commissioner who heard the evidence in these cases is, I understand, absent from Dublin on circuit.

Donaghmore Glebe National School.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the reasons which induced the National Board of Education to withdraw the usual grants from the Donaghmore Glebe national school on the 31st March 1906, and to since refuse to restore these grants, although the average attendance of children was such as to entitle the school to a continuance of them; can he state the number of schools from which these grants have been withdrawn within the last twelve months; and how many of them were schools in connection with the Church of Ireland.

Mr. BRYCE: The Commissioners of National Education inform me that upon the resignation of the principal teacher of the Donaghmore Glebe national school it became necessary under the terms of Rule 179 to consider the general question of the educational facilities afforded to pupils of the district within reasonable distance of their homes. In view of the number of schools under Protestant management in operation and their proximity to the residences of the pupils of the Donaghmore Glebe school, the Commissioners considered that there was no necessity for the further continuance of that school and that there would be no justification for the expenditure of public funds upon its maintenance. The Commissioners, accordingly, decided to withdraw grants from the 30th June 1906, and they have declined to reverse this decision. The average daily attendance has not reached the minimum required under the rules dealing with the point at issue, for any quarter during the present year. The number of schools from which grants have been withdrawn within the past twelve months was seventy-six, of which twenty-one were schools under the management of members of the Irish Church.

Longford Post Office.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will now direct that the wish of the people of the town of Longford, as expressed by their elected representatives, the urban council of Longford, to have the Longford Post Office kept open till 9 p.m. each week evening, be now complied with.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I fear that I can add nothing to the Answer which I gave the hon. Member on this subject on the 24th May last.†

Dring Telegraph Line.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether any progress is being made with the extension of the telegraph line to Dring, county Longford; and is it intended to continue the same to Aghnacliffe.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Telegraph business was commenced at Dring on the 27th ultimo. I am quite willing—as was my predecessor—to extend the line to Aghnacliffe if the necessary guarantee be given.

Belfast Post Office.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the scenes enacted at the public counter of the Belfast Post Office on the 23rd ultimo, when the men of the 4th battalion Royal Irish Rifles blocked the counter, owing to the failure to have adequate provision made for the payment of their money orders, members of the Royal Irish Constabulary who were called in were totally unfit to cope with the disturbance, and public business had to be suspended for upwards of one hour; and will steps be taken to avoid a failure of this description in future.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am inquiring into the facts, and will communicate with the hon. Member.

Irish Trade Statistics.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the annual statement lately issued of the trade of the United Kingdom, and in particular to the value of imports and exports at Tralee and other Irish ports; and whether, in view of the statement that the imports at Tralee amounted in 1905 to a value of £108,440, and that the exports amounted only to £784, he will state what relation these figures bear to the actual trade of the port.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The figures to which the hon. Member refers are those of the direct trade of Irish ports with places abroad. I am unable to state what precise relation the figures quoted as regards Tralee bear to the whole trade of the port, there being no official records of the value of the trade of Irish ports carried on with or through ports in Great Britain. Some light, however, may be thrown on the matter by the statistics of entrances and clearances of shipping with cargo at Tralee which in 1905 were as follows:—

	Entrances. Tons.	Clearances. Tons.
In Foreign Trade	14,037	374
In General Coasting Trade - -	16,151	31,170
In Trade between Great Britain and Ireland - -	42,072	6,414

MR. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Customs authorities at Belfast, Dublin, Limerick, and Cork formerly made it their business to collect returns of imports and exports?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am not.

MR. FLAVIN: At all these ports there are three authorities from which the information could be obtained.

Expiring Laws.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of repeated declarations of Ministers, he proposes to include the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, or any other temporary Irish Coercion Act, in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill this session.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs):

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliv., 1251.

I can only repeat my previous Answers to this Question, namely, that I cannot as yet tell the hon. Member which we propose to do.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): When will you?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot say.

Irish Home Rule.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the inquiry into the system of Government in Ireland, which was mentioned in His Majesty's gracious Speech from the Throne, it still proceeding; and whether any proposals have yet been formulated with a view to the introduction of a Bill next session to constitute a representative body in Dublin for the control of Irish finances, and the performance of such legislative functions as may be delegated to it.

SIR H CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. Gentleman need not be afraid that this question is escaping our attention. The subject is under the consideration of His Majesty's Government, but I am not in a position to make any statement on it.

MR. LONSDALE: I am not afraid.

Mr. Justice Grantham.

MR. ARKWRIGHT (Hereford): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, when he promised a day for the discussion of the conduct of Mr. Justice Grantham, he had before him the report of the Yarmouth trial; if not, whether he has now had an opportunity of perusing it; and whether he will make an early statement of the Government's attitude on the question, in view of the constitutional issues involved.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Government's attitude will be stated on Friday to the House. With respect to the first and second paragraphs of the Question, I shrink from creating a precedent which would justify hon. Members on other occasions in asking the Leader of the House not merely whether he has read a particular document, but when he actually did read it.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT (1882) AMENDMENT BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., without Amendment.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 236.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 236.]

Bill to be considered To-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

Order for Second Reading To-morrow read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

NEW BILLS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) ACT (1872) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend The Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, presented by Mr. Leicester Harmsworth; supported by Mr. Weir, Mr. Rainy, Mr. Ainsworth, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Annan Bryce, Mr. Cathcart Wason, and Mr. John Dewar; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 294.]

RECORDERS, STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES, AND CLERKS OF THE PEACE BILL.

"To make provision as to the appointment of deputies for Recorders, Stipendiary Magistrates, and Clerks of the Peace, and for the temporary performance of the duties of those officers in cases of vacancies," presented by Mr. Herbert Samuel; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 295.]

RIGHTS OF WAY (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the law relating to Rights of Way in Scotland," presented by Mr. Gulland; supported by Mr. Annan Bryce, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Major M'Micking, Mr. C. E. Price, and Mr. Dundas White; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 296.]

FATAL ACCIDENTS AND SUDDEN DEATHS INQUIRY (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Order [June 15th] for committal of Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill to the Standing Committee on Law, etc., be discharged, and that the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc."—(*The Lord-Advocate.*)

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N. W.) objected to the Motion upon the grounds that the Bill was essentially a legal measure and therefore it should be considered by the Standing Committee on Law. The House would see that the question at issue was really a very important technical question; it was nothing less than whether, in order to carry out the principle of the Bill—about which they were not quarrelling— changes should be made in the machinery of the Scottish legal system, and if so, what those changes should be. A question of that kind was not a proper matter to be dealt with by the Standing Committee on Trade. On the other hand, the gentlemen on the Standing Committee on Law were, many of them, members of the legal profession and a great number of them were Scotsmen. He had examined the composition of the Standing Committee on Trade and he found that something less than 15 per. cent. were lawyers and a fewer number still were Scotsmen. It was absurd to submit a question such as the one before them to a Committee so composed. He knew they would be told that the step was being taken to avoid a congestion of business on one Committee and a total absence of business on another, but what he complained of was that the Government should have allowed such a state of things to come about. He asked the right hon. Gentleman not to press his Motion, because such a step would hardly fail to create a feeling of prejudice in Scotland.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs) explained that the Law Committee were at present fully occupied with the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill and that there were four other Bills to follow for their consideration, all of which would take some time. In fact the Standing Committee on Law was completely blocked. On the other hand the Standing Committee on Trade was absolutely idle with nothing to do. Under these circumstances he thought one could hardly blame the Committee of Selection for asking the Standing Committee on Trade to get on with this Bill. The only observation which seemed to have any substance in it, put forward by the hon. Gentleman who opposed the Motion, was that the measure had nothing whatever to do with trade. He would point out that the Bill was one which advocated inquiry into all kinds of accidents in industrial occupations, and therefore he contended that it was very suitable for the consideration of the Standing Committee on Trade.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) said that the Dogs Bill, the Prevention of Corruption Bill, and the Irish Intoxicating Liquors' Bill all passed the Standing Committee on Trade in one day much to the credit of the promoters of the measures and the opposition, but it left the hands of the Committee practically free. It was very unfair to allow one Committee to be over burdened whilst another remained without anything to do. Further, he would remind Members opposite that there would be fifteen Members specially selected, and very carefully selected, who would be thoroughly competent to deal with the Bill. The Standing Committees had worked very well, and he did hope the House would be willing to make their task as light as possible.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) agreed that the work of the Grand Committee should be distributed as equally as possible, and no one would deny that the Standing Committee on Trade was composed of men of authority and position, who enjoyed the confidence of the House. The point his hon. friend behind him had raised, however, was not that one Committee should be over-burdened and another left idle, but that the Bill in question was clearly of a legal character only, and therefore should not be handed over to the consideration of the Standing Committee on Trade and taken away from the Standing Committee on Law. The arguments of the Lord Advocate, with regard to the commercial aspect of the Bill, was the most far-fetched he had ever heard in his life. He presumed that the Bill was not confined to accidents in industrial working. He thought reform was needed in the Scottish practice, which in some respects was perhaps behind the English practice. That did not make it other than a legal Bill, and he thought his hon. friend was fully justified in pressing upon the House that the Bill should be sent to a Committee upon which there were a larger number of members competent to deal with this particular class of problem than they could expect to find on the Committee on Trade.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs) said the case put forward by the hon. Member opposite rested upon the supposition that the Standing Committee on Trade and the Standing Committee on Law were separated by a great gulf in that they were of a totally different character one from the other, and that one dealt with all legal questions, and the other with all trade questions. When the hon. Gentleman had been a little longer in the House he would know that the difference between the two Committees was purely nominal; he would further know that this action had been taken on the recommendation of the Committee of Selection, who had power to add to any Committee in respect of a particular Bill fifteen Members possessing special authority or having acquaintance with the class of subject to be dealt with. Let fifteen law Members be added to the Committee on Trade and they at once had a nice legal body. That would be a great disappointment, however, to all those who looked at this question not from a technically legal but from a trade point of view. The most important part of the Bill was to lay down a method of obtaining improvement in the conduct of industrial labour so as to avoid accidents, and it was not a mere question as to how the law officers of the Crown should deal with it; it was one which more particularly concerned the processes of trade. But he stood upon what he first said, that the distinction between the two Committees was most shadowy and practically illusory. When the Committee of Selection had advocated a certain course, to endeavour to set it aside on the ground that a Bill involving legal points should go to the Committee on Law instead of the Committee on Trade was surely not a proceeding which deserved so much support as it had received from the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) expressed regret that the Government had not thought fit to carry out the promise given at the commencement of the session that there should be a Scottish Grand Committee. Had that been done they would not now be discussing this matter, and the existing Grand Committee would not be so overburdened with work.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said he had not perhaps fully realised that this course was undertaken at the request of the Committee of Selection. As it had been made quite clear that this was not an action taken by the Government, whilst he should still protest as strongly as before against the action, he did not propose to ask the House to divide.

Question put, and agreed to.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 8:—

*THE CHAIRMAN said the Amendments in the name of the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University† were not in order, as they, taken together, constituted an alternative clause which could only be moved if this clause were omitted.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said his Amendment was in substance the same as he was allowed to move on Clause 1, and was intended to give the owners of the schools as well as the local authority access to the Commission. He ventured to submit that that was within the scope of the clause.

---

† For general effect of the series of Amendments referred to, See second statement of Sir William Anson below.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the first Amendment, taken with consequential Amendments, amounted to a proposition which practically made it compulsory upon the Board of Education to make a scheme on undefined lines whereas the clause was that the local education authority, or, if the Committee desired, the owners as well, might apply to the Commission to make a scheme, and these schemes were to be made in accordance with legal principles as regarded the trusts and under certain prescribed conditions. Amongst other things they had to consider whether the carrying on of the school as a public elementary school was the best method of carrying out the trust, and would not make a scheme unless it was. That was a quite different proposal from the proposal of the hon. Baronet.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON submitted that so far as his Amendment went on the Chairman's ruling it was in order. He was quite prepared to withdraw the words "Board of Education," which he had proposed to insert lower down. All he desired to do was to give owners access of the Commission. His proposal was—

> "Where the owners of any existing voluntary schools held under charitable trusts or the local education authority, desire to do so, they may, if no arrangement has been made with respect to the schoolhouse under this Act, at any time after January 1st apply to the Commission appointed under this Act."

*THE CHAIRMAN said in that case the hon. Baronet had better take it at the point at which the same question was raised in the Amendment of the hon. Member for Kingston.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said that as he understood the ruling it would be out of order to move an Amendment which had the object of substituting the Board of Education for the Commissioners.

*THE CHAIRMAN said his ruling was not that at all. He had to take the Amendments of the hon. Baronet altogether, and they constituted a new clause outside this discussion.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON asked whether, if that were so, he would not be in order in moving to omit sub-section (1).

*THE CHAIRMAN said that to omit the sub-section would be practically omitting the clause. What the hon. Baronet desired to do had better be left until they came to the end of the clause.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought it was a very important matter. It might be that to omit the sub-section would be to emasculate the clause, but was that a ground for ruling the suggestion out of order?

*THE CHAIRMAN said that if the right hon. Gentleman would look at the clause he would see that the omission of the sub-section would make nonsense of the clause.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) moved to insert after "charitable trusts," the words "and the Charity Commissioners are satisfied that the object of the trust is solely educational." At the present moment the Charity Commissioners decided whether a trust was educational or not, and they had made, he understood, very considerable progress in deciding the nature of these trusts. So far as he could gather, under the Bill this power of revision was to be removed from the Charity Commissioners. He saw no reason for that; hence his Amendment, which was designed to provide that the Commission, in the preparation of schemes, should only deal with buildings held under educational trusts, leaving untouched buildings held under charitable trusts. This would be only carrying out the statement of the Minister for Education on the First Reading of the Bill. There were many trusts that were not solely educational. He had in his mind the case of a school where the building was conveyed to the trustees for a great number of purposes and used as an elementary school, Sunday school, parish hall, and gymnasium. If this clause was passed in its present form the trustees might not have the power to use the schoolroom for those useful purposes, and a great hardship would be done. The strongest support of the Amendment was to be found in the speech of the Minister for Education on the first Reading of the Bill. In that speech the right hon. Gentleman said that the owners of school premises included in Parts I. and II. were, of course, free agents and could refuse to allow the local education authority the use of their school premises, and could either keep open premises as a school without receiving any public money, close it altogether, pull it down, or do what they liked with it. After that statement how was it possible to ask the Committee to pass this clause, which put all schools held under charitable trusts under the Commission of three ?

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, after the word 'trusts,' to insert the words 'and the Charity Commissioners are satisfied that the object of the trust is solely educational.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) thought the right hon. Gentleman would have taken the opportunity at the outset of this clause of stating the names of the Commissioners, because it might entirely modify the views of many Members if the names were satisfactory. In discussing this Amendment they were discussing the composition of a body which would have almost unique powers.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said he was only waiting until he had an opportunity according to the rules of debate of informing the Committee of the names of the Commissioners. Before doing so he should just like to remind the Committee of what the duties of those three Gentlemen would be. The Commission had often been spoken of in the country as if the three Gentlemen would constitute an engine of compulsion—that was to say, that they should have powers unknown to the law of compelling schools to accept terms which they might be unwilling to accept. He desired to make it perfectly plain there was no element of compulsion in the matter. The duty of those three gentlemen would simply be to decide, according to the existing rules of law and equity, as understood by the recognised courts of law, whether or not——

*THE CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman appears to be travelling beyond the Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY asked if he might move the omission of the sub-section in order that the right hon. Gentleman might mention the names of the Commissioners.

*THE CHAIRMAN said it was quite open to the right hon. Gentleman to mention the names, but upon this particular Amendment he could not allow any comment or discussion on the question of the Commission.

MR. T. M. HEALY said it had been the common practice of Parliament to omit the first word of a clause to enable a debate to take place on the general question, although the omission of the word made nonsense of the clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. and learned Gentleman must know that they were discussing an Amendment beyond the first word of the clause, and the Amendment was to insert words which did not give rise to the general question of the clause. The President of the Board of Education, however, might give the names of the Commissioners now.

MR. DILLON hoped that whatever the order of the debate was to be it would be laid down and applied to all alike. If the Minister for Education was to make a general statement——

*THE CHAIRMAN: I stopped the right hon. Gentleman from making it.

MR. T. M. HEALY asked if it would not be in order for the hon. Member to withdraw his Amendment, and for some one to move the omission of the word "where." This was the most important matter in the whole debate, and he submitted that in a case in which the guillotine descended they were entitled to every consideration.

Mr. ASHLEY asked leave to withdraw his Amendment in order to move the omission of the first word of the clause, so as to enable the right hon. Gentleman to make his statement.

Mr. DILLON did not think the House of Commons ever discussed a Bill under greater difficulties. As the time allowed was extremely brief every facility ought to be given to the Committee to discuss the clause with some knowledge. Unless they got a general statement from the Minister for Education at the beginning of this clause the discussion prior to that statement would be waste of time.

*The CHAIRMAN: Do I understand the hon. Member to ask leave to withdraw his Amendment?

Mr. ASHLEY: On condition that the omission of the word "where" may be moved.

*The CHAIRMAN asked whether it was the pleasure of the Committee that the Amendment be withdrawn.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. T. M. HEALY moved the omission of the word "where."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 5, to omit the word 'where.'"—(*Mr. T. M. Healy.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'where' stand part of the clause."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he was entirely in favour of this course, but he would ask the Chairman whether he had not taken objection to some observations he made on the ground that his proposal would make nonsense of the clause, and whether this Amendment would not have that effect?

*The CHAIRMAN said he understood that this precise course had been allowed before under such circumstances as these, and that was why he now allowed it. It was a different matter from the proposal of the hon. Baronet.

Mr. BIRRELL said he could assure the Committee that he had no other desire than to make the plainest possible statement in the shortest possible time in order to enable the question to be discussed. But before announcing the names of the three gentlemen who had kindly consented to become Commissioners, he wanted to make it plain what their duties would be under the clause as it stood. Their duty would be to determine all questions brought before them by the local education authorities, aye or no, whether, having regard to the particular trust of the particular school upon which their opinion was asked, they thought that the school was bound by its trust, according to the existing rules of law and equity, to transfer itself to the local education authority in view of the provision of Clause 1. In other words, they would have to determine the principle *cy pres* if they thought honestly there was no other course open to the trustees of the school to carry out their educational trust. Assuming that they found that this trust was primarily educational, that their first obligation was to keep open in the parish or village a school for the education of the adult or infant population, if they found that as a fact upon the trust, they would then have to ask themselves this question, Ought the school, in order to fulfil the trust in the best possible way, to transfer itself to the local education authority? That was the kind of question, and the only kind of question, which would be submitted to them. These trusts varied very much. Some of them were what he called loose trusts—that was to say, they enabled the owners to apply the premises and property to other purposes than those of providing the young of the parish with education. All those trusts, of course, were open trusts, and he could not suppose that they would be brought before the Commission at all. What he contemplated was that the trusts which would be brought before the Commission would be what he called tight trusts—that was to say, trusts the primary object of which was educational and for the benefit of the children in the particular parish. Then it would be for those gentlemen to decide, aye or no, according to the principles of law and equity as they exist now—not as invented by them—whether or not the only proper way of fulfilling the primary object of the trust in order to continue the school as a school was to transfer itself to the authority. And now he was in a position to give the names of the Commissioners. The Right Hon. Sir Arthur Wilson, K.C.I.E. He was a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and everybody who had practised before him would agree that he was one of the most eminent judges we had in this country. Sir Hugh Owen. It was not needful to record his services. He was well known to every educationist in this country. He was the author of the standard work upon education and upon trusts. He had the whole subject at his fingers' ends as a practical man. Although he was by profession a lawyer, the labour of his life had been more in connection with our Civil Service. As everybody knew who had been brought into contact with him, he was a fair-minded man, who had a complete technical knowledge of the whole complicated subject of our education. The third name he proposed was one well known to hon. Gentlemen opposite. It was that of Mr. Henry Wilson Worsley-Taylor, K.C., who was a lawyer of very considerable distinction, and whom everybody knew as a most fair-minded man. Mr. Worsley-Taylor sat in the last Parliament on the other side of the House, and he was told that he made a very great impression on both sides of the House as an exceedingly fair-minded man. He had legal acumen and legal knowledge. And he (Mr. Birrell) was satisfied that these three gentlemen who had very kindly consented to constitute this tribunal would discharge their duties in a manner which would secure the perfect confidence of the whole country. Their duty, as he had already indicated, was the legal duty of administering the law as it existed, and no suspicion whatever could by any possibility attach to them.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR did not entirely agree with the right hon. Gentleman that the clause as it stood carried out the intention which he had expressed; but he did not propose to discuss that at the present time. He only rose now to say that the names the right hon. Gentleman had given the Committee were those of most distinguished gentlemen, and he ventured to say that no men of higher character could have been chosen.

Mr. T. M. HEALY asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. DILLON asked whether they were going to enter on the discussion of the clause on the assumption that it would remain in the Bill and be the accepted mode of procedure. There was an alternative procedure before the Committee, and it would have been well if they had been able at the outset to compare the merits of the two proposals. He did not desire to raise a general discussion now, but he hoped that at a later stage it would be in order to move an Amendment on which they would be permitted to compare the merits of the two methods of procedure.

Major SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) thought it would be convenient if the Committee could be informed where, if anywhere, the right hon. Gentleman could give an explanation as to the relative merits of this clause and of the proposed new Clause 3. It would be most unfortunate if through the curtailment of the debate by the Closure they were to go away from this point now and have no opportunity hereafter of discussing the relative merits of the two clauses which contained the most vital principles of the Bill. He would like the Chairman to state where an opportunity could be given to the right hon. Gentleman to make a statement.

Mr. BLAKE (Longford, S.) also urged the necessity of preserving an opportunity for discussing a proposal which was put on the paper in pursuance of a pledge given by the Minister for Education to bridge over a gap which he acknowledged to exist in the provisions of the Bill. The present course would render it almost impossible for the right hon. Gentleman to redeem his pledge, because they could not suppose that this clause had been brought forward as a sham.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he had not yet considered the Amendments sufficiently to say if there would be a convenient point at which to take the discussion asked for, and it was difficult to say how far a discussion on something not before the Committee could be allowed on some of the Amendments proposed on the clause. He thought the Committee should now allow this Amendment to be withdrawn.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. ASHLEY moved an Amendment to provide that the Charity Commissioners should decide whether the object of a trust was solely educational.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, after the word 'trusts,' insert the words 'and the Charity Commissioners are satisfied that the object of the trust is solely educational.' "—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said the point really was this. The hon. Member had spoken of the application being to the Board of Education, whereas it was to the Commission of three. Although, of course, he quite agreed that the Charity Commissioners had by virtue of Act of Parliament the power to determine whether or not a charitable trust was wholly or partially educational, the real reason why the Government established this Commission was that there were a number of questions they might have to determine. Were they to go to the Charity Commission they would have to reconstitute it by appointing temporary members. These applications might be very numerous, and the Commission was established in order that they might deal with them rapidly *de die in diem.*

SIR WILLIAM ANSON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had considered how far the power given to the Commission to determine whether or not a charity was educational, conflicted with the Board of Education Act, which gave to the Charity Commissioners the power to determine that question.

MR. BIRRELL said his attention had been called to that, and he was informed that there was nothing inconsistent with that Act in the present proposal.

MR. DILLON asked whether he was right when he understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that this clause would have no application to schools owned without trusts, and schools the trusts of which were not primarily educational. If that were so a vast body of schools would not come within the clause. Was it not necessary to insert words to make that clear?

MR. BIRRELL thought he had already made that plain in his opening speech. It was very difficult in an Act of Parliament to use the language that could be used in a speech to distinguish between the different kinds of trusts. It was, he thought, perfectly plain that the clause was only applicable by its language to those schools the trusts of which were of such a character that they could not properly be diverted from educational purposes. Where there was a private owner, he did not come under the principle of trusts; and where it was plain that a school could not be any longer carried on as a school solely belonging to a particular denomination, and might be turned into something else, that would not come within the scope of the clause. He would, however, consider the point of the hon. Gentleman, and if he could make the matter plainer he would do so. His only object was that it should be plain. It would be the task of the Commission, by applying the doctrine of *cy pres,* to ascertain whether a school could be carried on otherwise than by being transferred to the local education authority.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR, whilst acknowledging the lucidity of the speech of the President of the Board of Education, complained that there was a want of correspondence between the speech the right hon. Gentleman delivered the other day and his speeches on other portions of the Bill with the Bill itself. If the right hon. Gentleman would look at Clause 1 he would see that the observations of the hon. Member for East Mayo were absolutely justified. The right hon. Gentleman had said in his speech, or certainly implied, that the Commission were only to deal with trusts which were primarily of an educational character. The word education, however, was not, he thought, mentioned in the first sub-section. The right hon. Gentleman did not, according to his speech, desire that the Commission of three should deal with loose trusts; but the first sub-section required the Commission to make schemes even for such trusts. It was plain that there was a divergence between the speech of the right hon. Gentleman and the wording of the clause. He would not say that the wording was obscure, but it was very wide. If the right hon. Gentleman would look at it he would see that, taking a concrete case, if the managers or owners of a school with a loose trust refused to come to an arrangement with the local education authority, then the local authority were empowered by the Bill to bring the case of that school before the Commission. The three Commissioners were required to make a scheme "with respect to the mode in which effect is to be given to the trusts of the schoolhouse in the future." Therefore, so far from the action of the three Commissioners being confined and restricted under this clause, they were ordered and directed in every case where a general trust was brought before them to treat the trust and make a scheme for it. He accordingly hoped that the sub-section would be amended.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (SIR JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) did not think there was much foundation for the apprehension which had just been expressed. If the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London would look at sub-section (2) as well as sub-section (1) he would find it perfectly clear that all that was intended was to transfer a department of the administration of charitable trusts from the courts to the Commission. It was only in so far as an educational trust was a charitable trust that this section proposed to deal with it, and in order to be a charitable trust it must be one which cast a definite and precise obligation upon its trustees. If the trust came within the category of trusts in regard to education, the obligation in regard to education must be clear and precise. The object of the clause was to prevent existing voluntary schools in such cases becoming derelict. Owing to our educational legislation, a number of those schools would be unable to discharge their duty unless they came in under the general scheme of education. Under the law as it stood it would be the duty of the Charity Commissioners, and in a humble capacity his duty as Attorney-General, to prepare a scheme providing for the administration of the property on lines approximating as nearly as modern conditions would allow to the obligations specified in the trust. The court would be invited to sanction the scheme. This clause proposed to take that jurisdiction from the courts and vest it in a special Commission. The reason for the change was that if the courts were left to administer these schemes they might, their hands being full of other work, be an indefinite time in getting through them. The Commission was constituted subject to a very precise injunction. It was not to apply a new theory of law, but was to be governed by the doctrines which the Court of Chancery was in the habit of applying. The new machinery, he thought, would be much more useful than the old machinery, and it would act quickly. It provided, he considered, a very desirable solution of the difficulty which it was intended to meet.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the learned Attorney-General had made an excellent Second Reading speech in defence of the clause, and he had nothing to say against the hon. and learned Gentleman's survey of the policy of the clause, but contended that he had misapprehended the point which had been raised. The President of the Board of Education had drawn a distinction between loose trusts and tight trusts. All he had asked was that the schools under the loose trusts——

SIR JOHN WALTON: The clause would not touch them.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the sub-section applied to every school under a charitable trust, and a loose trust was a charitable trust.

SIR JOHN WALTON said as he understood a loose trust, it was not properly a trust at all. It was a trust that could not be administered on account of its vagueness. A loose trust where there were large discretionary powers which could not be precisely administered would not, he should think, come within the scope of the clause.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is a charitable trust, is it not?

SIR JOHN WALTON: It is not a trust at all.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that in that case the speech of the President of the Board of Education, which seemed so lucid, became utterly meaningless. There seemed to be in substance no great difference of opinion on this subject. If words were introduced making it clear that the sub-section did not apply to loose trusts, he did not see why the discussion need be prolonged.

MR. T. M. HEALY said the Minister for Education in his speech on the Second Reading made it clear, so far as he understood, that the Bill would not apply to the case in respect of which the Amendment was moved. He would remind the Attorney-General that they might have, not a loose trust, but a mixed trust—in one and the same deed a trust for educational purposes and a trust purely for recreation or amusements. This amendment was intended to meet such a case. That would not be a loose trust in any sense. A man might leave a block of buildings in Whiteacre—one-half of the buildings to be for the village school and the other half for a swimming bath or recreation hall. The use of the building might be absolutely indivisible. In introducing this Bill on April 9th, the Minister for Education said that, in the case of schools privately owned and those held in perpetuity partly for a non-educational use, the owners would, of course, be free agents altogether. Then what answer was there to this Amendment? The Amendment proposed that in regard to those mixed trusts the owner should be a free agent. The three Commissioners were to act as a sort of chapel of ease to the Court of Chancery, and act on the same principles as the Court of Chancery would. But as the clause was drawn it might be the instrument of great injustice. Who was to bear all the expense? Would the Commissioners sit in London? If so, witnesses with regard to property in Northumberland would have to be brought to London and kept here at the expense of the owners. If this court was to be a perambulating one, then the owner would have to bear the expense of taking eminent counsel down to Northumberland. There was a grievance either way. The education authority would be upon velvet, because they would have the rates to draw upon. There ought to be some provision in the clause for the enormous costs of these proceedings; there was none. This clause, which was to bring about the most tremendous changes in our judicature, was as absolutely barren of canvas as the mast of a ship. The Court of Chancery never could act, and never had acted, upon the principles here laid down. It would lead the county councils into a further dance with the money of the ratepayers.

*MR. ASTBURY (Lancashire, Southport) said he had listened to the speech of the hon. and learned Member for North Louth with the greatest amazement. The most dangerous thing they could do in an Act of Parliament was to try to limit in words the particular scope of the object they had in view, provided they could make that object clear without a verbal definition. The clause made it perfectly clear that trusts which were not primarily educational could not be interfered with. The Commission could not act except in the case of the schoolhouse of an existing voluntary school, which was subject to charitable trusts. The local education authority therefore could not act except in regard to an existing voluntary school which was the subject of a voluntary trust. It was suggested that there were existing voluntary schools subject to charitable trusts which might be called loose trusts, but before the local education authority could deal with such trusts they must relate to existing voluntary schools, subject to such charitable trusts. Then the clause stated that when no arrangement had been come to in 1907 the local education authority might apply to the Commission to give effect to these trusts in accordance with the principles followed by the Chancery Courts. If there was one thing more clear than another it was that the Court of Chancery would deal with the actual nature and character of the trust. Unless it was a defined trust the court could not deal with it. If it were a loose trust, in the sense suggested without this clause at all, if the Attorney-General were to apply for a scheme in regard to the school, it was perfectly obvious that the court could make no scheme at all. But the words of this clause were much more limited than hon. Members supposed. If hon. Members would look at sub-section (2), (*b*), they would see it was provided that the Commission, if they were of opinion that the use of the schoolhouse for the purpose of a public elementary school by the local education authority in accordance with this Act was the best mode of giving effect to that trust, might by the scheme make provision for the purpose, subject to certain conditions. He could not conceive how they could have anything plainer. If they had a school subject to trusts and in which there was difficulty as to the arrangements to be made between the trustees and the local authority, it was obviously for the benefit of those schools that they should have the rate aid. If that was to be secured in the absence of agreements it could only be secured under such a scheme as this by an application to an existing or newly-constituted court. It carried out the doctrine of *cypres*. This explanation would, he hoped, do away with any difficulty or haziness which might be in the minds of hon. Members as to what kind of trusts could be dealt with. They could only be trusts for carrying on a school which was a public elementary school. Allusion had been made to mixed trusts. He did not know himself any voluntary schools which were subject to mixed trusts, but if the two branches of mixed trusts were inseparable then it was perfectly clear from this clause that they could not be dealt with. [AN HON. MEMBER: Then why not accept the Amendment?] He thought the Amendment would limit the beneficial effect which hon. Members opposite and the Government wished to derive from this clause. The real object of the clause was this. In the case of a school subject to such a charitable trust, it could not be diverted to any purpose other than education. If that school was not taken over by the local authority what was to happen to it? They did not want the school to be lost, and unless it was taken over and worked as a public elementary school it would be lost, in the sense that it would get no Government or rate aid at all, and the whole object of the clause was that where they found schools subject to a trust of that kind a scheme could be made which would enable them to get Government and rate assistance in order that they might continue educational work in the future. If it were not for this clause what would happen? These schools would not be able, in consequence of their trust deeds, to be worked in the absence of agreements by the local authority. There was no trust deed in the country which enabled a school to be continued by a public authority without such a clause as this. If the Bill were passed without such a deed, and if it were not a wide clause, there would be a number of schools which could not give public elementary education under Clause 1, or be public elementary schools at all under the circumstances contemplated. In those cases the Attorney-General would be compelled to go to the Court of Chancery, and the school would be wound up or sold, and the proceeds applied for educational purposes under the doctrine of *cypres*. Another point made was that these charitable schools would be subjected to very great expense under this scheme, but it seemed to him that very great expense would be saved to them. All these schools must go somewhere to obtain a scheme. The Court of Chancery had jurisdiction over them, and they would have just as much expense and trouble, if not more, in arguing their case before that tribunal as they would have in doing so before this Commission. The Commission would not sit in inconvenient places or at inconvenient times, and it would save a great many of the trusts from extinction.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) could not help thinking that they wanted some sort of words such as those contained in the Amendment. He had listened to the speeches of the Minister for Education and of the Attorney-General, and he quite admitted that the intentions of the Minister for Education were excellent, but his speech did not correspond with the clause. The right hon. Gentleman said that but for this provision these schools might be left derelict, but there was nothing in the clause to prevent their being left in that position if the local authority wished. Then the right hon. Gentleman said that there was no difficulty in the definition of charitable trusts. But what about the loose trusts, to which allusion had been made? A loose trust, they were told by the Attorney-General, was no trust at all. The Minister for Education said that it was a trust, but it was not one which was primarily or necessarily educational. He took it that a loose trust was a mixed trust, and it would be necessary for this Commission to define it, unless there were words in the Bill to prevent them. It was difficult to say what was an educational trust and what was not. If the Commission once started out to define what was an educational trust they must invade the province of the Charity Commissioners as defined in this Act of 1899. But apart from the question of mixed or loose trusts, what he wished to ascertain was what security they had that particular trusts would not be broken. The local authority alone had access to the Commission, and the agreement was to be one on the part of the local authority. The trustees might not be a party to the agreement arrived at. The term "a bilateral agreement" had been used, but he thought it was wrongly used, because one party only was agreeing and the other party had no voice in it. These were points which he thought ought to be cleared up. He thought they did need some definition of the expression "charitable trusts," and some clear indication of what were to be the duties of the Commission in respect to trusts which were loosely defined. He did not mean trusts partly educational and partly not, but trusts for giving education in connection with religious instruction of some special character. That was a point which would recur again and again in the course of the clause, and which he thought ought to be disposed of. He entirely agreed that the Commission was composed of gentlemen in whom all on the Opposition side of the House had confidence, but they did wish to have their powers defined, because they would have to deal with an enormous number of schools in the country, and it was desirable that they should feel that security was obtained for them.

MR. BIRRELL said he would gladly insert a definition of charitable trusts in the Bill if he honestly thought there was any good purpose to be served by doing so. But a definition always had a very limiting effect. He remembered Cardinal Newman saying that the definition of Papal infallibility had the effect of restricting its effect in people's minds rather than of extending it. Who was to say, having regard to the hundreds of varieties of verbal expressions in trust deeds, what was a loose and what was a tight trust? He could not undertake to give any definition in a matter of that kind which would prove satisfactory. He knew, of course, that there were certain trusts that were so obviously loose that if it was found the school could no longer be carried on as a denominational school it would be within the power of the trustees to say that it could no longer be continued as an educational trust, but they would exercise the alternative trust. They were empowered to say that one set of provisions authorised them to carry on a school and another set of provisions authorised them to do something else. That was a kind of trust over which this provision could have no kind of effect, and the words upon which hon. Members could rely in such cases, and upon which he also relied would be found in sub-section (*b*). The words referred to an educational trust and if the local education authority were so ill-advised as to bring "a loose trust" before the Commissioners, they would suffer for it in not being able to get the use of the school. All that they were seeking to acquire was the continued use of particular premises for a particular purpose—namely, for the use of elementary schools; and if the "mixed trusts" did not interfere with that object when the schools received State and rate aid, he thought that they were unlikely to interfere in the future. The Government were seeking to perpetuate the educational succession of these schools, and to enable them to go on as public elementary schools under the same conditions as before. All that the Commissioners would do would be to see whether or not the public elementary educational work was to continue in the school under the ægis of the local education authority; and this would depend on the nature of the trust. This subject had received very careful consideration.

Mr. WYNDHAM (Dover) said he quite admitted that the introduction of very precise words in an Act of Parliament often led to a result quite different from that desired, but the desire of the Opposition for precision on this point was a very natural one. Earlier in the afternoon they were creating under the clause an elaborate compulsory tribunal to come into operation where negotiations had been carried on and had not been concluded. That was what they thought, and the words that had been complained of were simply used because of the belief that where the owners of the school had found it impossible to come to an arrangement this tribunal came in and acted as an umpire against whose decision there was no appeal. The speeches of the Government and their supporters had left the Committee in great doubt, not only as to the effect, but as to the object, of the clause. The right hon. Gentleman would have made the purpose of the clause clear if he had touched on Clause 2, sub-section (2) which gave the trustees all the powers, protections, and advantages which the Committee had been told were to be found in this clause. What became of any protection given by Clause 3 unless the Committee made it precise by the introduction of this Amendment? The cumulative effect of Clause 1 and subsequent provisions had really deprived owners and trustees of these schools of any advantages of any sort or kind. What became of the school belonging to private owners or of schools under "loose trusts?" Were they to be frozen out?

*Mr. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said that as far as the Wesleyan schools were concerned there was some anxiety to know how the clause would operate. At the same time, however, they had no reason to fear its operation. The suggestion in the Amendment that the Charity Commissioners should be called into action before the local authorities acted in order to decide whether a trust was wholly educational would, in the opinion of the Wesleyan Education Committee, cause unnecessary delay and expense. In the opinion of the Wesleyan Committee it would be quite satisfactory, in connexion with many hundreds of their schools, to leave to the Commission the duty of stating whether the trusts were educational or otherwise. The Minister for Education had just stated that, if those trusts were not distinctly educational trusts, it would not be within the purview of the Commission to deal in any way whatever with the revenues of such charitable endowments. In other words, the Commission would have no jurisdiction. But what they were really concerned to know was what was going to happen with reference to some of their schools as to which it was difficult to say whether they were, or were not, educational trusts, and whether the schoolhouses did even come within the operation of the clause. In connection with their places of worship they had in many cases buildings on adjacent sites, costing in many cases £5,000 or £10,000; buildings which were erected partly for purposes of secular education but which were largely used for the purposes of Sunday schools as well as day schools. He presumed that under the clause it would be open to the local education authority to pick and choose between the denominational schools. The Wesleyan Education Committee did not object to that; but then came the question, what was to happen to the school that was left. As far as he understood it, it was open to the local education authority, not having taken the school, to say they would take the trustees of that voluntary school before the Commission, that they were of opinion that something might be gained for the locality from the educational standpoint by compelling the Commission to settle what was to be the future application of the educational endowments of that particular school. It was important to the Wesleyan Education Committee to know whether he had rightly interpreted that clause. He wanted the Minister for Education to answer, if he would, these two questions:—(1) Whether the local education authority had power to summon the trustees of a Wesleyan school, or a Wesleyan building which was supposed to be impressed with an educational trust, before the new tribunal to settle what was to be the future application of any educational endowments connected with that school, even though the school building was a part of a Wesleyan Methodist church property and enterprise; and (2) supposing the Wesleyan Church decided to run one of its voluntary schools in future as a private venture school, as a State-aided or some other type of school, would the conditions under which that school would be run in future come in any way whatever, on the application of any educational endowment appertaining to that school, under the jurisdiction of the new tribunal?

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, King ton) asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would not put an end to the matter by inserting, after the words "charitable trusts," the words "for educational purposes." That would put into the Bill words which the right hon. Gentleman had used in the debate. There were many cases of buildings held upon charitable trusts not being educational trusts, but which were in fact used for educational purposes. In cases of that kind the point was, was the Commission to have jurisdiction or not?

MR. BIRRELL: No.

MR. CAVE said he quite understood that that was the right hon. Gentleman's view, but he wanted to have it made perfectly clear in the Bill itself, so that it should not be in the power of the local authority to hale before the Commission, whether they would or would not, those schools which, in the words of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman on the First Reading, "admit of a non-educational use."

MR. DILLON expressed the opinion that, if the clause were brought into harmony with the speech of the Minister for Education, it would relieve a good deal of anxiety. He was concerned with loose trusts, which largely prevailed no matter what the Court of Chancery might think on the matter—trusts which, primarily educational, gave to the trustees full discretion to use the schools for other purposes. Let them take the case of a trust of a Catholic school where the deed said that the building was to be used for the purposes of a Catholic school or any other religious purpose. If that was not an educational trust, what would it be? He would like to be assured by some clearer words that a school could not be captured as an educational trust notwithstanding the fact that there was an alternative. The speech of the Minister for Education would come as a surprise to many people in the country.

MR. BIRRELL: I thought I had made it perfectly plain that, under the scope of this clause, only those schools could be compelled to permit the use of their premises for the purposes of a public elementary school when it was quite plain that that was the only way in which they could discharge their trust.

MR. DILLON said that, unfortunately, many of them had come to regard the right hon. Gentleman's speeches as one thing and the clauses as another. Unless there was some more clear language used it was not unnatural that there should be a good deal of nervousness and anxiety about this clause. He had studied it very carefully and it appeared to give them no protection. Where there was an alternative discretion these Commissioners might not consider the use of the building as a primary school as the best mode provided for under sub-section (*b*) and hand over the school for that purpose even if the trustees objected. He thought the case which had been made out was unanswerable. He was inclined to think that the best means of meeting this difficulty was by a proviso. Surely the Minister for Education did not argue that because it was difficult to find words to limit the discretion of the Commissioners they must never attempt to do so.

*MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) thought it might be taken as an indisputable proposition that the Commissioners would not interfere with any trustees or any trusts which could be properly carried out. Let them take the case put forward by the hon. Member for East Mayo where trustees held a building upon a trust for Catholic educational purposes or to sell it or use the building for any other purpose. That was a trust which the trustees could carry out without applying it to educational purposes, and in that case no order could be made requiring the trustees to apply it for educational purposes, because they would be met by the trustees saying that their trust gave them a complete discretion to apply the building either to educational or to other purposes. The Commissioners would have jurisdiction only in cases where the property was held upon trusts which obliged the trustees to apply it, to some extent, to educational purposes. The object of this clause was to meet the case which arose owing to the passing of Section 1, which said to trustees holding premises upon trust: "We will not give you any money unless you come under public control." The result would be that a large number of schools under educational trusts would not be able to be carried on by the trustees for educational purposes at all, and the object of the Bill was not to interfere with trusts, but to enable trustees to carry out their trusts. In the case of an educational trust, the object of those interested would be that the trust should be carried out in the most beneficial manner. The position which had to be met was this. Supposing this clause was not passed, and it was left to the ordinary law, and Clause 1 came into operation, no further public money would be given to those schools held upon trust and they could not be carried on. Consequently the local authority would have to make provision by building new schools for the children in that particular district, with the result that a large amount of public money would be spent in building new schools to accommodate the children now attending the trust schools who would have to come out of them as soon as Clause 1 came into operation. The trustees would then be holding schools upon trusts which they could not carry out and the Charity Commissioners would come down upon them and they would have to form some scheme for carrying out those trusts. Of course they could not do it so beneficially if the educational part of their trust had been fulfilled by the expenditure of public money in building new schools. The result would be that in a large number of instances the schools which could have been transferred most beneficially could not be transferred at all for that purpose, and they would have to be dealt with in some other manner not so beneficial. The hon. Member for the University of Oxford seemed to think that these three Commissioners would make orders behind the backs of the trustees. He would remind the hon. Member that the three Commissioners would be acting in a judicial capacity, and it was inconceivable that they would make any order in respect of any schools or trusts without giving full opportunities to the trustees to be heard. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover had spoken very disrespectfully of subsection (*a.*). He wished to point out that that sub-section was a necessary part of the machinery for dealing with the matter according to the scheme of the Bill. The object of the Commission was not to let schools become derelict and allow them to be dealt with before the appointed day arrived, so that they might know whether to build new schools or take over the old schools. If the trustees said they intended to carry on the school that would be a complete answer to the jurisdiction of the Commissioners. But the Commissioners would have to be satisfied that the trustees *bona fide* intended and were able to fulfil their trusts by continuing the school, and were not merely attempting to make the Act unworkable. The question whether the trustees *bona fide* intended to fulfil the trusts would often be a very difficult one, and might give rise to expensive litigation unless there were some definite rule laid down to guide the Commissioners.

in determining the matter. The object of sub-section (1) was to guide the Commissioners and to tell them that they were not to treat a declaration that they were going to carry on the school as *bona fide* unless they were able to show a good and sufficient guarantee that the school would be effectively continued for, at least, five years. That was a matter of machinery enacted merely in the interests of economy and to save the enormous litigation which might arise over that question. With regard to the stricture passed by the hon. and learned Member for North Louth, of course the Commissioners would act in accordance with the rules which were usual in the Court of Chancery, and they would have something corresponding to the preliminary investigation in Chambers. They would not bring down expensive counsel to deal with the matter until they had had a preliminary inquiry and determined whether any important and difficult questions arose.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Where is the matter provided for?

*MR. HERBERT said the Commissioners would provide their own procedure.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Who is going to provide the money for clerks and officers?

*MR. HERBERT said he had not the precise provision in his mind, but he had no doubt it was provided for. He was sure they need not trouble themselves about that, for the money would be provided to enable the procedure to be properly carried out. The Amendment, as he understood it, would provide for an appeal to two public bodies instead of one—first to the Charity Commissioners to determine whether the object of a trust was educational; and then, if they determined that it was, there would be a second appeal to the three Commissioners. It appeared to him that the Amendment would double the expense and double the delay in applications for schemes.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said the hon. Member who had just spoken, and also the hon. Member for Southport, appeared to have forgotten altogether sub-section (2) of Clause 2, which provided that the trustees under any trust deed had full power to transfer their school to the local education authority, apart from any question as to the application to be made to the Commissioners for a scheme under Clause 8. Therefore Clause 8 did not come upon the scene at all until the trustees had been unable or unwilling to come to an arrangement with the local education authority. Clause 8 provided that the local education authority—

> "May, if no arrangement has been made with respect to the schoolhouse under this Act, at any time after the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and seven, apply to the Commission appointed under this Act to make a scheme with respect to the mode in which effect is to be given to the trusts of the schoolhouse in future."

The hon. Member for North Louth had asked a question which he ventured to answer at once in the affirmative. If the trustees held a school on what was called a loose trust—he adopted that word as meaning a trust where the trustees had discretion, and could use it alternatively—they might use the schoolhouse either for the purpose of public elementary education, or if they thought fit, say in the case of the Wesleyans, as a place of worship or meeting house. That discretion was absolutely vested in them. The trustees could be taken by the local authority before the tribunal under Clause 8, and the tribunal could be asked to make a scheme with respect to the mode in which effect was to be given to the trust of the schoolhouse in future. [Cries of "No, No."] Hon. Members said "No, no," but the clause said so. When the trustees were brought before the tribunal the principles of the Court of Chancery were to be followed. The Minister for Education had stated that the new tribunal had power to interfere only in cases where that was the only mode of giving effect to the trust, but the right hon. Gentleman in his speeches from time to time had omitted to refer to the important provision in sub-section (*b*) of this clause that in making a scheme the Commission might make provision for the use of the schoolhouse for the purpose of a public elementary school if they were of opinion that that was "the best mode" of giving effect to the trust. That was a discretion which the Commissioners would be bound to use instead of the trustees. In the ordinary case the trustees would have the discretion of using the schoolhouse as a place of meeting, and that was a matter for them to determine, but if the local education authority applied for a scheme it would be entirely for the Commissioners to determine "the best mode" of giving effect to the trust. It was perfectly clear that under the clause as it stood trustees who held a school on an alternative trust would, when taken before this tribunal, have their discretion taken away. In that way the clause would become a gigantic engine of oppression. If the local education authority were unable to get the terms they wanted out of the trustees they had this gigantic engine to bring them to reason from their point of view. Trustees who wished to keep their schoolhouse as a church instead of a school could be brought before the tribunal and have a scheme forced upon them. That would be a gross injustice to trustees of what he called alternative or discretionary trusts, who might not have gained the good graces of the local education authority.

*Lord BALCARRES said the hon. Member for the Louth division had stated that in his opinion the Charity Commissioners would be called in to settle the nature of the trust before the Commission under Clause 3 came into operation.

*Mr. PERKS: I said I thought that would be the necessary effect of this Amendment, but not of the clause as drawn.

*Lord BALCARRES said that was a point on which he wished the opinion of the Parliamentary Secretary. The Minister for Education had stated that it was quite obvious that this clause was only to apply to educational trusts proper. Who was to settle the precise nature of those trusts? He understood the hon. Member for the Louth Division to say that there would be some antecedent body which would discriminate between the various trusts, and that when this stage was passed it would be obvious whether a school came under Clause 8 or not. Those who had studied the Return of non-provided schools in Kent knew that there was an extraordinary variation in the schools in the different communities. From the admirably drawn up Memorandum by Mr. Selby Bigge which was prefixed to the Return it appeared that a large number of the trusts were of what might be called a "loose" character Who was to settle whether those trusts in Kent were or were not trusts which should be dealt with by the Commissioners? It had taken five or six months to produce this Return, and in view of that fact it was evident that it would take a long time to examine the 12,000 or 15,000 trusts throughout the country, in order to ascertain whether they would come under Clause 8. He wished to know whether there was to be an antecedent stage before the trusts came before the Commissioners.

Sir E. CARSON (Dublin University) said he wished to put a concrete case. Supposing it had been decided that an existing voluntary school had an alternative trust—what was called a loose trust—could the trustees of that school be brought before the Commission at all? If they could, they were driven to sub-section (2) to see what would happen. The Commissioners had to proceed exactly as if they were the Court of Chancery. It was too absurd to tell the Committee that once the trustees had been brought before the Court of Chancery the only thing the Court could do was to dismiss the case altogether. If they proceeded according to the methods of the Court of Chancery, it would be open to the Commissioners to say "We have got the same powers as the Court of Chancery, and we are bound to act on the same principles; and looking all round we find that the best way is to utilise the trust for the benefit of the school." It was not a question for the discretion of the trustees, but it was for the Commission to determine how the trust was to be carried out. Was, then, the alternative trust to be within the jurisdiction of the Commission? When there was this divergence of opinion on the point, and seeing that this was a matter of large importance, he could not for the life of him understand why, instead of using the words "under charitable trusts," the Government, if they were perfectly clear as to what they meant, should not put in the words, "to be settled in trust for educational purposes only."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said that the right hon. Gentleman had put a concrete case which, it was claimed, would enable one to touch the difficulty and to solve it without trouble. The case was that of a trust which had an educational purpose and an alternative purpose; and the right hon. Gentleman had asked if such a trust was brought before the Commission what was the nature and extent of its powers as affecting the alternative trust. The answer was quite clear. The Commission was compelled to give effect to the procedure of the Court of Chancery. It was its duty to act according to the principles of the Court of Chancery. What were those principles? If anyone brought such a trust before the Court of Chancery, and if the trustees were willing to give effect to the alternative trust, it was their duty to do so. The Committee had been somewhat misled by the language used with regard to this Commission, as if it were a Commission with roving and unlimited powers. It had no such powers. It must act on the principles followed by the High Court of Chancery; and in the case of an alternative trust there could be no doubt about its action. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University asked why they should not add the expression "to be settled in trust for educational purposes only" after the words "held under charitable trusts." They were, however, here dealing only with the school houses of the existing voluntary schools. What was an existing voluntary school? It was defined by this Bill as a public elementary school, so that they were dealing with a public elementary school under trust. He did not think it would add to the force of the clause if they spoke of a public elementary school being held only in trust for educational purposes. That followed obviously on the language of the clause. Reference had been made to tight and loose trusts; but there was no doubt whatever as to the kind of trust with which the Commission would have to deal, viz., trusts affecting public elementary schools. Private adventure schools would not be affected at all. If the owners of any school chose to say, "We do not wish to transfer our school; we are going to carry it on as a certificated efficient school, and we shall give the proper guarantee to the Commissioners in that respect," they were entirely free to do so. This clause was only framed to deal with the difficulties of those schools the owners of which could not carry them on as efficient schools. It referred to schools as to which there had been no agreement under Clause 2, and which found themselves in a difficulty because they were not self-supporting trusts, but were dependent upon the Parliamentary grants. That was the difficulty from which the Commission would help to relieve them. The Commission would really operate in the direction of benefiting those schools which one might call derelict. To limit the powers of the Commission by the use of the word "solely" would have a tendency to cut those schools out of the operation of the clause, which he thought was not exactly what hon. Members opposite wanted. To cut them out for Clause 2 by a failure to come to an agreement under that clause and from Clause 8 by inserting the word "solely" would put them in a financial difficulty of a very serious character.

MR. T. M. HEALY made a suggestion which he thought would solve the difficulty, namely, after the words "educational authority" in line 6, to insert "with the consent of the Attorney-General." This Government would certainly be in office during the next five years, and surely there could be no objection to saying that the interpretation of this clause should be subject to the consent of the law officers of the Crown during that period. An hon. Gentleman below the gangway had said that it would be unfair to have any one before this tribunal, putting him to all the costs, unless there was something in the nature of a preliminary inquiry. Clause 9 provided for nothing of the sort and he thought the suggestion was a very proper one. There was another alternative, that the local education authority should make it a condition precedent that the costs of the inquiry should be paid by the trustees.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) rose to a point of order and asked whether the remarks of the hon. Gentleman were relevant to the Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY: May I suggest, Sir, that my hon. and learned friend has points of order on the brain.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. and learned Member's remarks were, as he understood it, by way of recommending an alternative to the Amendment before the Committee and bore on the question which would naturally and properly arise on the Question before the Committee.

MR. T. M. HEALY said they all wished to find a solution of this question, and he hoped the Government would reconsider their decision.

SIR E. CARSON said the Solicitor-General had admitted that where there was an alternative trust the trustees might be brought before the Commissioners. Before the trustees were brought before the Commissioners he thought there ought to be some preliminary step, perhaps the *fiat* of the Attorney-General, so that if it was not necessary that course should not be taken.

MR. ASHLEY thought they all wished the same thing, viz., that the trustees should not be brought before the Commissioners unnecessarily. He hoped the Government would accept an Amendment standing lower down in the paper in the name of the hon. Member for Kingston to insert after the word "trusts" in line 6 the words "for educational purposes only." That would define the trusts, and if it were agreed to he would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) said he desired to be quite clear as to the learned Solicitor-General's answer to the important question put by the hon. Member for Louth, and to inquire whether if the trustees of a school decided to carry on their public elementary school as a certified school, and therefore free from control or interference by the local education authority, the passing of this clause would enable that use to be made of the trust money and the trust property. He put the concrete case of a school which had been carried on for many years as a public elementary school under trusts for that purpose. With a view to the perpetual endowment of the school a scheme had been sealed by the Board of Education embodying certain conditions as to the governing body, management, and religious teaching, to which the scheme gave the sanction of the law. On the faith of that scheme having been sealed granting the specified conditions money had been handed over and property conveyed. If the trustees considered that the conditions thus sanctioned by the Board of Education could not be carried out by this Act, were they entitled to convert the school into a certified school and so leave it free from the operation of this clause, although it had up to now been carried on as a public elementary school?

SIR W. ROBSON said if he correctly gathered the purport of the hon. Gentleman's question he had previously answered it. There was nothing to prevent owners of an efficient school from carrying on that school as a certified school, and there was nothing to prevent the Commission from framing a scheme for that purpose.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. ASHLEY moved to insert in page 5, line 6, after the word "trusts," the words "for educational purposes only."

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 5, line 6, after the word "trusts" to insert the words "for educational purposes only."—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 167; Noes, 306. (Division List No. 187.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E)
Acland-Hood, Rt.Hn.SirAlexF.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope

Arnold-Forster,Rt Hn.HughO.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach, Hn. MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.
Coates,E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway)
Dillon, John
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Halpin, J.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hammond, John
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill,Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt. Hn. Col.W.
Kilbride, Denis
King,SirHenry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Chas. W.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon.Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond William (Clare)
Roberts,S.(Sheffield (Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson,W Mitchell-(Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Ashley and Mr. Rawlinson.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont,Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Gethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black,ArthurW.(Bedfordshire)
Bolton,T.D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J. F. L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce,Rt.Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.

Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt. Hn. SydneyCharles
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,Sir T.Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir W. J. (S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield. A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dodd, W. H.
Duncan,C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner,Col.Alan (Hereford,S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davis, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St Pancras,E.)
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lever,A.Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lutterell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W. H. M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Cent.)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee
Robertson,SirG.Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.

Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Watt, H. Anderson
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Wiliamson, A.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Woodhouse, Sir J.T. (Huddersf'd

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*MR. CAVE moved to insert in line 6, after the word "authority," the words, "or the owners of the schoolhouse." The effect of the Amendment, he said, would be to give power to the owners of the schoolhouse as well as to the local authority to apply to the Commission for a scheme affecting the schoolhouse. As the Bill stood at present if the negotiations for the transfer of the schoolhouse broke down, the local authority could appeal to the Commission for a scheme to compel the owners to transfer the school to themselves. But while the local authority might do that, the trustees or owners had no power under the Bill to make an application. The result would be that the owners would lose their school in any event; for if the local authority took it over they lost it, and if the local authority did not apply the owners would not be able to carry on the school, and in all probability the building erected for the purposes of a school and suitable for no other purpose would have to be sold for what it would fetch. If that was the alternative before the owners when they come to negotiate, what kind of negotiation would that be? Would not a contract entered into under such conditions be a one-sided contract? He thought no one would say that it would be a fair contract. What he proposed was that the Commission should be open to the owners as well as to the local authority; that if the local authority wanted the school they should apply, and that if they did not and the owners thought the school was one that ought to be transferred they should be at liberty to apply. Of course, they would have to satisfy the Commissioners that the school was one that should in the public interest be transferred. Hon. members opposite said they could not see why the application to the Commission was objected to, because it was really for the purpose of securing that the school should be carried on in accordance with the trusts. If hon. Gentlemen really wanted to assist them in carrying out their trusts, why not open the door to them in the way he proposed? It was said that for some purposes this Commission would be in the position of the Charity Commissioners under the Charitable Trusts Acts. But under those Acts application could be made either by the Attorney-General, by persons interested in the trust, or by the owners or trustees of the property in question; and where the total annual value of the trust property was over £50 it was expressly provided that no application could be made except at the instance of the owners. But he was not asking for that. He merely asked that the owners should not be cut out; that they should have power to go in on equal terms, and that the Commission should be an impartial judge between the parties instead of being an executioner, as at present proposed. He was sure that his Amendment would commend itself to many members in the Committee, as all he asked was for fair play and an open field for both parties. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 6, after the word "authoity" to insert the words "or the owners of the schoolhouse."—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be inserted."

Mr. BIRRELL said that though there might be a good deal to be said for the Amendment, it was absolutely impossible to make it fit in with this clause. In spite of all that had taken place hon. Members opposite did not seem to realise the particular kind of duty which it was sought to lay on these Commissioners. He had never said that they should settle the terms of the bargain between the parties except in a case where the local authority wanted the schoolhouse for the purposes of a public elementary school and the owners of the school would not let them have it. In that case the local authority would go to the Commissioners as lawyers and say, "Here are the trusts of the school. Look into them and consider them and then answer this question. Is it not the duty of the trustees, having regard to the obligations of the trusts, either to keep this school in their possession as a certified efficient school or to transfer it to the local authority?" That was the sole duty which they sought to impose upon the Commissioners. They did not wish to make them the authority, and they would not be so good as the Board of Education to determine whether or not a local authority should take over a particular school the owners of which were desirous that it should be taken over. The whole object was that the Commission should deal with those who did not want to be taken over, and to find out whether they were entitled to persist in refusing to be taken over. The Amendment might be a very good argument in favour of his new clause, but it was inconsistent with the purposes of this clause. He did not think they could put upon the Commissioners he had named this new burden. [An Hon. Member: Will they not be paid?] Yes, but that did not meet his objection. The Prime Minister might have selected other persons, but the duties they had to perform were legal duties and they had to find people acquainted with the law of trust. They were men of legal mind and training and it might be taken that they would do perfect justice and interpret trusts in a proper spirit.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said the speech of the Minister for Education had thrown an entirely new light upon this clause. There was nothing in the clause to suggest that it would bring reluctant and recalcitrant trustees to justice. If a trust school was disregarded by the local authority where the trustees desired to be taken over and desired to have access to the Commission, he contended that they should have the opportunity of coming before this very competent court to decide upon what terms they were to be taken over. They were not asking for nearly so much as was to some extent conceded under Clause 2. There they asked that owners who had a school structurally efficient and satisfactory might be able to claim to have their school taken over. They were not now asking for that, but simply for access to a court to determine whether a scheme might not be framed for a school which the local authority had left derelict. The ratepayers might be put to the expense of building new schools which in point of expense and of character might be unsatisfactory to the inhabitants of the area who desired to maintain the voluntary schools. He asked the Minister for Education to look at this matter from the point of view he had put before the Committee. There were a number of trust schools anxious to be transferred; the local authorities might decline to make any arrangement which was satisfactory; and the result would follow that the schools would be left derelict and would be excluded from the operation of the clause. They were asking to come before the Commission to decide what terms would best carry out their trust and continue their career as public elementary schools. That was not much to ask for, and if the clause meant what the right hon. Gentleman said it meant let it be made clear. They were now told that under this clause they could only deal with trustees who had shown themselves negligent in the exercise of their trust and had given the local authority reason to say that they must come before the Commission to determine the terms on which the school might be taken over. He hoped the Government would either alter the words or accept the Amendment.

Major SEELY said they had been told that they could not discuss the new Clause 3 now and the right hon. Gentleman had also told them that they could not discuss bilateral compulsion. The Bill as it stood was not just. There were elaborate provisions in Clauses 3 and 4 for certain kinds of schools to be transferred if the trustees and the people desired it; and yet when all the conditions which the Committee wished to impose had been fulfilled, if the local authority happened to be intolerant they might allow the school to become derelict. On the other hand, the owners of the school were compelled under the Bill to surrender their property. Clearly that was unfair and could not be defended logically. The Minister for Education had fully admitted that the case was indefensible.

Mr. BIRRELL: No.

Major SEELY said he had the right hon. Gentleman's words in his pocket.

Mr. BIRRELL: Something has been done to Clause 4.

Major SEELY agreed that something had been done to Clause 4. Compulsion where it was applied must necessarily apply to both parties. He could not understand why the Amendment had not been accepted. The only answer given was that it did not come in this part of the Bill. Upon a former occasion they made an appeal to the Minister for Education, and he very graciously agreed to do what they asked for, but now he told them that he would only be able to do it if somebody who was hostile to them would agree to something which probably they did not want.

Mr. T. M. HEALY said the Minister for Education had told them that this was a penal clause to punish persons who refused to accept the provisions in the earlier part of the Bill, and that he could not contemplate the idea of any person seeking to punish himself and applying this machinery of torture to his own person. That might seem a very good answer, but it was not sound. He would give as an illustration what happened under the Act of 1881. Mr. Gladstone proposed to allow tenants to fix a fair rent; but it seemed to be an injustice, and then an option was also given to the landlord to fix a fair rent as well. The definition clause must be considered, because the extraordinary thing was that in regard to the expression "owners," it provided that "where a schoolhouse or any interest therein is vested in the official trustee, or where any difficulty arises as to who are the owners of the schoolhouse or any interest therein, any persons recognised, or appointed to act, as owners for the purpose of this part of this Act by the Board of Education shall for those purposes be deemed to be the owners." In other words, as in the case of the ladies before Solomon, a false mother might be found as the owner of the property, because the true owners might, in protection of their interests, and in order to evade the legal process, throw every possible difficulty in the way. They might then suddenly find themselves ousted by a nominee of the Board of Education, and they were not even allowed to come in to defend their property or trust. It did seem to him that the proposal of the hon. and learned Gentleman was one that was well deserving of consideration. This was a question not of drafting, but of substance. It would be very easy to put in a catch clause at the end which would save the blushes of the draftsman. But he did say that to allow an owner, for years probably, to have this threat held over his head by people who did not ever mean to put it into effect would involve trouble and cost to the owner which he ought not to have to suffer.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS hoped the President of the Board of Education would resist the temptation to fall in with the appeal of his hon. and learned friend, who did not vote for the Second reading of the Bill. Those who voted for the Second Reading were in favour of this clause as it stood now, and, according to the Minister for Education, the Amendment proposed was entirely inconsistent with the clause. The principle of Clause 8 was that the local education authorities were not bound to take over any school, and the Committee had already determined that question. This Amendment, however, attempted indirectly to put compulsion upon the local education authorities. So far as the mass of denominational schools were concerned, their case had been dealt with, and, as he thought, fairly satisfactorily to hon. Members opposite, by the Amendment of Clause 4. Whether that was so or not, it was quite clear that the essence of Clause 8 was that the local education authority were not bound to take over any school. The Commission to be set up was hardly the body to determine the question whether the school was structurally fit and whether, having regard to all the local circumstances, the school ought to be taken over. The Commission had to look into the law affecting the trusts of these particular buildings. He was glad his right hon. friend had spoken as he had done. Those who voted for the Second Reading of the Bill deserved to have their appeals attended to more than those who voted against the Second Reading. The only form of Clause 8 consistent with the Bill was the clause as it now stood, and therefore he submitted that the Committee should vote against the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the doctrine of the hon. and learned Gentleman was surely a very novel one; it was that those who voted for the Second Reading voted for the Bill as brought in and printed, and that therefore they required special consideration if any alterations were to be made in the course of the discussion.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: In regard to the principle of the Bill, I mean.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the only expositions of the principle of the Bill that the Committee could regard as authoritative were those of the Minister in charge of the Bill, and he ventured to say that the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman were not in favour of the principle of local option, which the hon. and learned Gentleman over and over again had said was the one redeeming quality of the Bill. It was true that the Government had been rather frightened, by such speeches as that which the Committee had just heard, into adopting a different attitude, but the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman were on record, and the time might come when they would have to draw them out *in extenso*. All he would say at this moment was that it would be entirely at variance with the traditions of the House, and render all discussions in Committee entirely nugatory if the Government refused to accept an Amendment simply because it was not, and indeed could not be, in the Bill as originally introduced. He would point out what appeared to be the gross injustice of the clause. To this transaction of converting a voluntary school into a provided school there were two parties—the local authority and the owners of the school. The Government were aware that, as far as the owners of the school were concerned, they might be inflicting a considerable hardship upon them by a compulsory transfer. Yet while they gave power to the local authority to compel schools to come in, they gave no corresponding power to the owners of the school. The position of the local authority was made easy; the position of the owners of the school was rendered difficult, and even intolerable. Why did the right hon. Gentleman prevent the Commission looking into any case which was brought before it by those responsible for a trust? Why was it that only those who wished to get hold of the school and not those who were responsible for the school were to have permission to go before this body? The local authority was free to reject every part of the scheme made before the tribunal to which they themselves had appealed, but the parties who were not allowed to appeal to the tribunal were bound by the scheme. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it was really inconsistent either with his idea of justice or with the frame work of the Bill, to extend to the owners of the schools all the assistance which the new machinery gave to the local authority. It would be unfair to exclude one party from going before this tribunal if it desired to do so, and to make the decisions of the tribunal binding only upon that party. That was the fundamental injustice underlying Clause 8. He earnestly hoped in connection with not only this

Amendment, but the whole scheme of the Bill, that the Government would consider how harsh was the treatment meted out to those schools, and that they would endeavour to remove the feeling of injustice and unmerited wrong which would result from this perfectly arbitrary treatment. The right hon. Gentleman must feel that there was a basis of justice in the demand put forward, and that he could remedy this gratuitous inequality without injuring his Bill. He hoped, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman would make the necessary alterations.

MR. HERBERT said the Amendment moved by the hon. and learned Gentleman had some considerable attraction for him. He did desire that the owners of schoolhouses should be put in a position of equality with the local authority to enable them to make a fair bargain when it came to a bargain. While he was impressed with the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman in putting that point, it seemed to him that the answer of the President of the Board of Education was a substantial and practical one which they were bound on the Ministerial side of the House to accept. It had to be remembered that speaking as they ought to do for the public in this matter, they could not put on the local authority the obligation to take over a school which was not needed, even if it was structurally perfect. The Commission was not a proper body to inquire into the question whether a particular school was required, taking into account the circumstances of the district in which it was situated.

MR. DILLON said the hon. and learned Member for the Wycombe division forgot that this was an alternative to Clause 3, and that if this was put in the Bill Clause 3 would be withdrawn. The Minister for Education was in an extraordinary and unparalleled position. He did not remember anything analagous in connection with any Bill he had heard discussed. The Committee did not know what the intentions of the Government were in regard to Clause 3. The case made out by the Leader of the Opposition against the present proposal was absolutely unanswerable. It was proposed that the local education authority should be able to take the initiative and bring the trustees of a voluntary school before the Commission, and that they should not be bound to accept the scheme prepared by the Commission, or any provision in the scheme [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] The power was contained in sub-section (b). The President of the Board of Education in adumbrating this clause laid down that it should be bilateral. It gave, however, to the local authority a right which was denied to the schools.

MR. BIRRELL said that so far as the actual Amendment was concerned he did not think he could add anything to what he had already said. Clause 8 was quite consistent with the Bill as introduced. He had never for a moment overlooked the fact that there was this gap. The language which he used in introducing the Bill was—

> "The second clause of the Bill proposes to authorise the local educational authorities, for the purpose of continuing any existing voluntary school as a provided school, to make, with the consent of the Board of Education, any arrangement they can or think fit, by agreement with the owners of the schoolhouse, for obtaining such use of it as is required for carrying on a public elementary school. That is to say, they may make such arrangements as they can by agreement with the owners of these buildings, or such of them as are fit for the purpose of carrying on within their walls, as heretofore, the business of a public elementary school. . . ."†

Later on in the same speech he said that in those schools which had been acquired, special religious teaching of the kind stipulated for would be given if demanded by the parents. The Bill never contemplated imposing on any education authority the obligation to take any school. He had never contemplated perpetuating, nor that it was the duty of the Government to seek to perpetuate, the existing state of things. The Government never intended to proceed on any other basis than that the local education authority should have the option of determining which of the voluntary schools it wanted in order to carry out its obligation of providing for the school children in its area. He started, therefore, with that view. Then it was, of course, pointed out that there was a gap. He had acknowledged that it was there, and he was asked what was the answer if the local education authorities chose to wage a vendetta warfare against all the voluntary schools in the country. There was no answer except that such a thing was particularly improbable, though the Bill did not impose any obligation on the education authority. Then there was the Amendment of the hon. Member for Oxford University, which sought to remove the gap by imposing an obligation on the education authority to take over in general terms any voluntary school that wished to be taken over, or, as the hon. Member said, wished to be confiscated. He said at once that it was impossible to come to any such agreement as that, but that, if they wanted to do business, he saw that there were advantages to be gained from the fact that, if all the schools were to be taken over, there must be a bilateral obligation. It would impose on the owners the obligation to part with their schools if the local education authority wished to have them, and it would get rid of all the questions that would be submitted to the Commission of three. If the trustees chose to say, "We do not worry about our trusts; we are prepared to hand over on terms," that would be a very useful thing, and get rid of the heavy work that would be imposed on the Commission. He could not impose his new clause on hon. Gentlemen opposite because it was not any clause in his Bill. It was an eirenicon, and it imposed on private owners an obligation he expressly excluded them from. There was only the compulsion of the law in certain tight educational trusts. The private owner and the trustee with an alternative trust were, so far as the Bill was concerned, free agents. They could snap their fingers at the local authority. The only person who could not say, "You shall not have the school" was the person whose trusts were of such a character that the principles of law or equity placed him under an obligation. He might be obliged to transfer. He could not impose his new clause on the Committee, but he certainly proposed it as a good settlement, and, as to the time for discussing it, it would be the first of the new clauses, and the Committee would find, he thought, that there would be ample time for its consideration. He admitted the matter was in a tangle, and he thought that, if he had been a more experienced Parliamentarian, he would have been content to express his offer and to wait for hon. Gentlemen opposite to press it further. He had done the best he could for facilities under both Clause 3 and Clause 4, and he had no anxiety to avoid discussion on this new clause. It certainly would have a full opportunity of being discussed. What its fate would be he did not know, and consequently he was obliged to go on with Clause 8 as it stood, though he quite agreed that, if the new clause were adopted, Clause 8 would have to be considerably modified. He could only say he could not accept the Amendment under this clause. It would upset the whole scheme. It would impose on the Commission a kind of duties they were not qualified to perform, for they would have to collect information which the Board of Education had already got, and it would impose on them administrative work which they could not be asked to do.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clv., 1027.

Mr. T. M. **HEALY** said that, however much those on his side of the House might differ from the right hon. Gentleman, they recognised his candour and the charm of his language. The right hon. Gentleman, however, had not met the point. These local bodies were shifting and changing bodies. They were elected every three years, and, whatever plan in the nature of a counter proposal was made to the Commission, they might either refuse to accept the scheme or say, "We find the burdens on our taxpayers so great that we throw over the whole thing." Accordingly the supporters of the Amendment said, "Permit the manager or trustee himself to set the education authority in motion. Let him be a plaintiff instead of a defendant, and say 'Either impose this trust as a matter of perpetual obligation on this body or let me be free for ever from it.'" Was that unfair? Was it not common justice? The right hon. Gentleman had said that they had no right to refer to Durham and no right to cast suspicion upon the local authorities, but when statements of that character were made by great local authorities when the Bill was merely before the House of Commons, what would they do when it became an Act of Parliament? If they said these things in the green tree, what would they do in the dry? There was a spirit abroad among local education authorities which rendered defence absolutely necessary on the part of school managers and trustees. If this was to be a punitive clause, would any man come before the Commissioners, as an applicant, to apply for an order in regard to purchase unless he had no other resort? The provisions of the clause were calculated to drive a man into the fire and he thought they were entitled to have some reconsideration of the matter. The schools ought to be given a final appeal on this question, and it should be made plain that once the local education authority set the ball rolling they had taken an inevitable step, and that if they started a scheme they must stick to it; if they had put the county to the expense of £3,000 or £4,000 they must bear that responsibility. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education had not met the argument which he had addressed to the Committee.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 109; Noes, 247. (Division List No. 188.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J. (City Lond.
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hammond. John
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mooney, J. J.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Major J. B.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Alden, Percy
Allen, A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barlow, Jn. Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beauchamp, E.

Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets, S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T.D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. F.
Cowan, W. H.
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dodd, W. H.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas

Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. H.

Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford(Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen

Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, W.
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON moved to substitute January 1st, 1908, for January 1st, 1907, as the date after which applications to the Commission might be made by the local authority, in the absence of arrangement, to make a scheme in regard to an existing voluntary school held under a charitable trust. When they discussed Clause 1 the President of the Board of Education held out some hope that he might, as the Bill went through Committee, reconsider the dates which were fixed in it, and he ventured to think that, having regard to the late period of the year and the arrangements of the Government for an Autumn session, there was no great probability of arrangements being made between the trustees and the local authority, before the 1st of January, 1907. If no such arrangements were made, the trustees might under the Bill at once be brought before this Commission, and he thought the Minister for Education would see that it was fair to allow a certain interval to elapse during which the parties to these complicated transactions for the transfer of elementary schools should discuss and consider the arrangements to be made. He thought that everybody would feel that they should have an opportunity of coming to a fair arrangement satisfactory to both parties. If the Bill was to come into operation at all, he, for one, would wish that it should be worked with the utmost good will on all sides, but he did not think that that would be the case if only a month or six weeks elapsed between the time when the Bill became law and the time when the parties to these difficult transactions were brought before the statutory Commission. Therefore he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to extend the dates in the Bill not only at this part of it, but elsewhere, so as to allow a year to elapse before the trustees could be treated in the way which the Bill contemplated and be brought struggling and reluctant before the Commission. He thought a year should be allowed to elapse, for the purpose of giving the trustees an opportunity of considering the new condition of things to be brought about by the Bill. If the additional time was accorded, he hoped that in the course of the year it might be possible for some friendly arrangement to be made and further friction in regard to these schools avoided. Under the construction put upon the clause by the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education, it was only to operate where the trustees were found wanting in the exercise of their proper duties towards their trust, and if they declined to carry on their schools under arrangement with a local authority, they were to be brought before these three distinguished gentlemen who would settle the terms of the transfer. Before this took place, however, he thought some time should be allowed to elapse, and it was in his view somewhat farcical, having regard to the lapse of time which must take place before the Bill became law, to bring it into force at so early a period. Although when they first asked for an extension of time in May it was considered unreasonable, what was unreasonable then might be considered reasonable now in July. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take that view and allow this extension.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 9, to leave out the word 'seven' and to insert the word 'eight.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'seven' stand part of the clause."

Mr. BIRRELL said he did not think any useful purpose would be served by putting this matter off for a whole year. He thought the provision might be trusted to inflict no injustice on any man. On the other hand, he thought the right hon. Gentleman had overlooked the fact that already the owners of these schools, by access to the public Press and taking some interest in what was going on, had in all probability acquainted themselves with the nature of their trusts and already knew what their legal rights were. He thought it would be a pity that a whole year should be wasted when many of the owners were perfectly ready to submit their case as to whether they were so restricted by their trusts as to be obliged to accept the proposals of the local authority.

Mr. RAWLINSON joined in the appeal that had been made by his hon. friend. He pointed out that the right hon. Gentleman had apparently lost sight of one fact in his courteous reply. He had said that these trustees were prepared to submit their case, but they had no power to do so. They had no power to apply at all. It was the local authority only who could invoke this tribunal. Therefore it was not a question of the willingness of the trustees, but of the willingness of the local authority to invoke the aid of the Commission. And their willingness would not come into question until sufficient breathing time had been allowed for a negotiation with the trustees and for the negotiation to fail. It was not probable that this Bill would pass into law until December. If it was passed in December and the tribunal commenced its work on January 1st, no breathing time would be left at all. An unreasonable authority could rush these matters before the Commission at once. If there were first to be negotiations between the local authority and the trustees the Commission should not come into existence or be called into requisition before a reasonable time had been allowed for a settlement to be arrived at between the parties. Then why should they go to the trouble and expense of appointing a Commission which was to come into existence on January 1st? He submitted that they had a perfectly good case for asking for further time and for asking the Government not to allow this Commission to come into being until at least a year later, so that the parties might be able to exhaust all methods of arriving at a compromise before they were rushed before this tribunal.

Mr. BLAKE (Longford, S.) said that if the Bill did not become law before the 31st of December it would not become law this session. But if it became law he did not think the question of expense was worth considering, having regard to the other issues involved. He could not conceive that the Commission would allow itself to be hurried into action until reasonable time had been allowed for negotiation, and therefore he was of opinion that the Government's proposition was preferable to that of the hon. Baronet.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) said that if the Government seriously desired to have as many schools as possible coming to terms with the local education authority, without having recourse to the Commission, they were in his opinion taking a very unwise course in refusing to extend the time mentioned in the section. He thought at one time the right hon. Gentleman would be prepared to extend the time, if not for a year, at least for six months. He believed there should be an extension of time for the reason that the trustees might feel from reading the words of this section that the local education authority could take them at once before the Commission. If they felt that, they might think it would be impossible for them to come to an agreement with the local authority for want of available time to consider the question, and they would therefore dismiss any idea of attempting to come to an arrangement. If it was the wish of the Government that the voluntary schools should come to an arrangement voluntarily, the right hon. Gentleman must admit that the longer the time that was given to consider the question the less chance there would be of any friction.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON said the great bulk of the voluntary schools in this country were held on trust, and he thought that if the right hon. Gentleman desired voluntary arrangements to be made it was essential that some time should be given. If this Bill became law in December and this section came into force on January 1st what chance was there of making any arrangement? The Bill changed before their eyes every day. Even now there was a new clause which they might not have an opportunity to discuss. As the Bill contemplated the possibility of arrangements being come to, it would be most unreasonable to put such arrangements out of the question by bringing these compulsory powers into existence so quickly.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said he desired to mention a further point, and that was the early date at which this Bill was to come into operation. It was totally contrary to their usage to put an Act of this kind in force at so early a date. The argument held even stronger as regarded the exercise of the powers under Clause 8. He believed that many negotiations would reach a satisfactory conclusion if more time were given; whereas if the matter were hurried there might be regrettable action taken, resulting possibly in a hot dispute. It was also very desirable that more time should be allowed with a view to the framing of schemes. There was no doubt that these schemes in a large proportion of cases would assume something like the form of by-laws and regulations. If that were so, and they were to be satisfactory, it was really essential to the good working of the clause that ample time should be given for consideration. That applied to schools of every character. His suggestion was made in the interest of the public generally, and of education, and with a view to the effective working of the Act.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said in view of the fact that it might be re-considered at a later stage of the Bill he would ask leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. RAWLINSON moved to omit the words, "Commission appointed under this Act" and insert "Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice." He said the onus of defending this exceptional legislation clearly lay with the Government, and to-night they had learnt definitely that the Commisson when appointed was to do nothing more than the Court of Chancery was doing at the present time. If that were so, what was the object of having a Commission on exactly the same lines as the Chancery Division? The clause from the procedure point of view was absolutely inadequate. It was highly expedient that instead of this Commission, which was the final court, being troubled with every case from start to finish the preliminary questions should be taken in chambers instead of in open court. That was done in the Chancery Division by Masters, and it was highly desirable that interrogatory matters should be dealt with in that way. Under the Bill there was no sort of machinery to deal with preliminary matters. It had been hinted that the Chancery Division would be over-worked. The judicial power of that division was at present very strong, and the Judges were well abreast of their work, so that there was ample time for them to deal with this matter. Then there was the question of costs. He ventured to submit that it was to be an itinerant Commission. The cost of bringing witnesses to London, however, would be infinitesimal, and the number of witnesses to be examined comparatively few. Such questions as that of the proper construction of a trust would be tested apart from any evidence at all. The expense of taking assistance from London to the country would be greater than the cost involved in bringing people from the country to London. There was the great prestige of the Chancery Court. The general public had thorough confidence in the Chancery Judges. He was not for a moment reflecting upon the capacity of the three gentlemen who it was proposed should constitute the Commission. The point was that a decision of the High Court gave greater satisfaction and carried more confidence than that of any arbitrator sent down to a place to determine a case. The mere fact that the Commissioners were appointed under a controversial Bill by the Government must necessarily tend more or less to weaken the confidence of the general public in any decision arrived at by them. Was it necessary to put into a Bill already teeming with difficulties and with matters sufficient to cause suspicion among trustees whose property was being dealt with in this way, a proposal of this sort, when there was at hand a tribunal fully competent to carry out the desire of the Government that the trusts should be administered according to the same law as they always had been ?

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, lines 9 and 10, to leave out the words 'Commission appointed under this Act,' and to insert the words 'Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. MICKLEM (Hertfordshire, Watford) questioned the wisdom of allowing these arrangements between the trustees and the local authorities to go first to the High Court, then to the Court of Appeal, and then to the House of Lords. After a case had gone through the tribunal of the House of Lords, having regard to the fact that it was a matter which involved certain religious disputes between the trustees and the local authorities, the House of Lords might decide that they had no power to deal with it and might themselves appoint a commission, as they had recently done in regard to another matter. Such a suggestion would not be made by any member of the Bar who had practised in the Chancery Division of the High Court. It would mean that in each case where the trustees and the local authority did not agree there would be heavy expense incurred in trying the matter before the court. His hon. friend seemed to think that it was a very simple matter to try a case in the Court of Chancery. Apparently he had overlooked the fact that although at the present moment the work of the Chancery Court might not be so heavy as in former years, yet it was so heavy that the Judges were always engaged on that work, and to bring in a number of new cases would inevitably mean delay. It would also mean that in every case they would have to have the whole business done by professional lawyers. Why did they want to bring in the lawyer to settle these disputes ? Let them imagine bringing such disputes up to the High Court and employing counsel to argue the matter in Chambers. The expense of trying these matters before the High Court would be very great. If the trustees were reasonable, in nine cases out of ten they would be met by a reasonable local authority. If there was any difference of opinion the Commissioners would go down to the locality and settle the matter in ten minutes to the satisfaction of everybody.

Lord R. CECIL said he had never heard a speech with which he more profoundly disagreed. It was their old friend, the advantages of arbitration over the courts of the country. These were not cases which could be decided by tossing up a halfpenny. Questions might arise involving considerable legal difficulties, such as the construction of trust deeds. But he could not support the Amendment, because the particular tribunal constituted by the Government consisted of very eminent and impartial gentlemen, and he preferred that these three gentlemen should try the issues that might arise in the first instance. He recognised that it would be desirable to have some kind of appeal on points of law. For those reasons he should not be able to support the Amendment.

Mr. BLAKE said he was averse to the practice of imposing special duties on Judges of the High Court which tended to divert them from the discharge of their ordinary duties. The Commissioners would be fully competent to discharge the judicial duties which would devolve upon them, and the discharge of those duties would be facilitated by the combination of an effort to moderate asperity between the parties. The characteristics that belonged to these gentlemen were such as led to the belief that a moderating influence would be exercised, such as would not come into play under the rigidity of proceedings before the court. At the same time provision should be made for appeal upon legal points.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) did not think the Amendment was serious, and it was obvious it met with no support. Reasons against it had been clearly stated and he hoped the Committee would come to a decision.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON said the hon. Gentleman was in the habit of supposing a question was not serious until the course of discussion undeceived him. He was himself impressed with the value of the Commission until he heard from the hon. Member for Watford the sketch of the manner in which those gentlemen were to do their work. According to that hon. Gentleman the considerations which induced trustees to withhold their school from a local authority were to be disposed of within a short interval between luncheon and the departure of an afternoon train. If such was to be the off-hand manner of dealing with the construction of a trust deed he was inclined to think there was much to be said in favour of the Amendment of his hon. friend. If they were to be told that the Commission was to deal in this off-hand and high-handed manner with the construction of a trust deed, he was inclined to think that, unless they got more information as to the *modus operandi* under this Bill, it would be much better to go to the Court of Chancery. There was an appeal from a judgment of the Court of Chancery, but there was to be no appeal under the Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON moved to omit the words after "scheme," and insert "for the use of the schoolhouse for the purpose of a public elementary school in accordance with the trust of the schoolhouse." He said that on Clause 2 the Minister for Education pointed out that the local education authority was to have the use of the schoolhouse for the purpose of a public elementary school, and, so far as was necessary, to carry out the necessary repairs and alterations. His object was to limit the use of the schoolhouse by the local authority to that purpose, and beyond this, to enable the trustees to carry out the intention of the trust as nearly as possible. The words in the clause left open the possibility of the building being used for a purpose other than that of an elementary school. He believed it was the intention of the Government that the use of the schoolhouse should be confined to the purpose of a public elementary school.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 10, to leave out rom the word 'scheme,' to the end of subsection (1), and insert the words 'for the use of the schoolhouse for the purpose of a public elementary school in accordance with the trust of the schoolhouse.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. LOUGH said there had not been a single argument advanced in favour of the Amendment. The Government much preferred the words in their own drafting of the Bill. He could not conceive any reason for making the change proposed. The Amendment did not seem to be in any sense an improvement on the words proposed to be left out. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would not think it necessary to press the matter further.

Lord BALCARRES said the Parliamentary Secretary had not met the point raised by his hon. friend. There were certain trusts which had dual obligations—namely, to deal with elementary education, and to deal also with parochial work of a charitable and social nature. The Amendment moved by his hon. friend would make perfectly clear what the Commission was expected to do in relation to these trusts. The Parliamentary Secretary had brushed aside the Amendment as if it were an obstructive or stupid one, but it was obvious that these dual trusts were more numerous than the hon. Gentleman seemed to think. He appealed to the hon. Gentleman to give this matter fuller consideration than he had yet given to it.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) said the position which the Parliamentary Secretary had taken in regard to this Amendment was an extraordinary one. It seemed to him that there was great force in the Amendment and that it deserved greater consideration than had been accorded to it by the hon. Gentleman. The Amendment preserved the right of the pious donor to use all the money he had given for the purposes of the trust. He trusted that the hon. Gentleman opposite would give some reason why the desires of people who created trusts should be ignored as would be done if the clause were passed as it stood.

*MR. PERKS said he hoped the Government would give an answer to two very important questions on which hitherto they had not had a very clear answer. He asked these questions on behalf of the Wesleyan Education Committee, representing a large number of Wesleyan schools in the country, and he hoped he might have a clear answer. The first question was whether in the event of Wesleyan church trustees being unable to come to an agreement with the local authorities concerning their schools, which he hoped would not be the case, the local authorities might cause such trustees, to appear before the Commission for the purpose of inspecting and readjusting their trusts. The other point was whether the Commission had jurisdiction to draft a scheme for Wesleyan trust property, where the trusts were partly for education and partly for non-educational purposes. Might they take it authoritatively from the Government, as absolutely their intention that in such cases, the moment the Wesleyan trustees produced their model church deed or other legal instrument which provided for school and church purposes, the Commissioners were required to decide that they had no jurisdiction? He hoped the Solicitor-General would give them a clear answer to these very important questions, as the Wesleyan church had large interests at stake, and they wanted to know how the clause affected them.

SIR W. ROBSON, who was almost inaudible in the Gallery, was understood to say that in regard to the first question the answer was that the local authority might be left to deal with the trustees, and bring them before the Commission if they desired that a scheme should be made. But if the trust deed was one which involved an alternative trust, the Commission would never dream of doing more than the Court of Chancery, or of drawing up a scheme of its own when there was already an adequate way of dealing with it provided in the trust deed.

*MR. PERKS: How is the local authority to know what the trust deeds contain until they get the trustees before the Commission.

SIR W. ROBSON said he did not think the trustees would display any difficulty about letting the local authority know what the trust deeds were. As to the second question put by the hon. Member for Louth, whether the Commission had jurisdiction to draw up a scheme where the trust was partly educational and partly not, that again depended on the trust. It was impossible to answer precisely questions of this kind which covered an immense variety of trusts or to say what the Commission might hold in regard to some particular trust. It would be the duty of the Commission to give all the effect they could to the terms of the trust deed.

SIR E. CARSON said he thought that the question which had been raised in this debate was one of importance having regard to the way in which the clause was framed. It might be that the Government only meant to give jurisdiction to the Commissioners in the case of elementary schools, but that was what they did not say. In fact they said exactly the contrary. As the hon. Member for Louth had said, unfortunately the opinion of the Solicitor-General expressed in Parliament would not have the least effect on the Court when the Act came to be construed. What was the scheme of the section? It was that when the trustees were brought before the Commission, the Commission was to frame a scheme with respect to the mode in which effect was to be given to the trust of the schoolhouse in the future. And then by sub-section (*b*) if the Commission were—

> "Of opinion that the use of the schoolhouse for the purpose of a public elementary school by the local education authority in accordance with this Act is the best mode of giving effect to the trust they may by this scheme make provision for the purpose, subject to such conditions (if any) as to payment or other matters as may be agreed to by the local education authority, and as the Commission think just."

The very fact that restrictions were put upon the Commission showed that they were to fix a scheme to carry out the trust. The object of the Amendment of his hon. friend was to restrict this section to that which the Government said was their purpose, viz., that the Commissioners were not to interfere with the trust unless for the purpose of making it available for a public elementary school if they thought that that was the best way of carrying it out. Anyone who had looked at the Return laid on the Table of the House would see that this clause would bear on an immense number of schools where there was an alternative trust. He thought there could be no doubt that, under the section as it stood, even in the case of an alternative trust, there would be jurisdiction for the Commissioners to settle a scheme for the purpose of carrying out that trust.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 282; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 189.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dodd, W. H.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Lief (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald

M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks,G. Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montgomery, H. H.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,RobertJohn (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thos, (W. Monm'th)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott (Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, SirA.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh,N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord(Norfolk,Mid)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc)
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galw'y
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Gov'n
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants., W.)
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hn.Col. W.
Kilbride, Denis
King, Sir HenrySeymour (Hull)
Law, Hugh A.(Donegal, W.)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacNeil, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down, S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip

Meagher, Michael
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Snowden, P.
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

LORD R. CECIL moved to amend sub-section (2) by leaving out paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*), including the four sub-clauses of paragraph (*b*), and substituting for them the words "and shall have regard to." He said that the effect of the Amendment would be to direct the Commissioners to act in accordance with the principles followed by the High Court in exercising as the successors of the Court of Chancery the ordinary jurisdiction as to charities inherent in that Court, and to have regard to such other circumstances as might, in their opinion, properly be considered. By the clause as it stood the Government directed the Commissioners to make a scheme in accordance with the principles of the High Court, and then proposed a series of limiting instructions which could only result in cutting down the price to be paid by the local authority to the owners of the schoolhouse. That was an unsatisfactory way of dealing with the question. The proper way of dealing with it was to leave the Commissioners a free hand and direct them to do justice between the parties according to the principles of the High Court of Justice. That was the course which was pursued in much simpler matters and in regard to subjects of much less importance. Under the ordinary arbitration clause the view had been taken that it was not a proper course to give the arbitrators instructions. The proper course to take was to appoint a proper tribunal and leave them to administer the matter acting upon general considerations. The only purpose of these sub-clauses was to cut down the price. In regard to sub-section (*a*), why should a five years guarantee be required for the effective continuance of the school? Surely that was a matter which might well be left to the Commissioners. Supposing the Commissioners were satisfied that the trust could well be carried out without a guarantee, or a guarantee for a shorter period, why were they to be compelled only to pass a scheme which would bring a guarantee for five years into force? He thought that there were very few cases in regard to which the proposal would be necessary. He could not, moreover, conceive upon what ground of justice sub-section (*b*) was imported into the Bill. If the school had received grants or assistance from public funds towards the building or repair of the schoolhouse it had only received its proper payment for the performance of public duties, and he did not see why, the schoolhouse being the property of the owners, such considerations should be taken into account, in fixing the price to be paid. Then in regard to the provision that the Commissioners should take into account the limited nature of the user of the school by the local education authority, that was quite unnecessary. He quite agreed that it was a question to be considered, because it necessarily arose. But it was not necessary to put such a direction into an Act of Parliament, and as he had said, the only effect of doing so would be to invite the Commissioners to give a less price than they would otherwise award. Again, he could not imagine what bearing the facilities given in the school for special religious instruction and the performance of the original trusts had to do with the matter. The facilities given would not benefit the owners of the school house but the children, who had received or would receive instruction. Then it was provided that the Commissioners should take into account the cost of maintenance and repair. But that was a matter which any tribunal would naturally consider without any special direction. If one was buying a property, naturally they would consider the cost of keeping it up, and of course it was an element which must be considered in fixing the price. To insert such a provision was an insult to the Commissioners, and only showed the animus with which this sub-clause had been drawn. ["Oh."] Well, he could not see what other purpose was served by putting these provisions in. They were certainly not put in to increase the price, and their only object could be to cut it down. In his judgment that was the whole object of the clause. He thought that when they were appointing a special tribunal composed of very eminent gentlemen, they might trust them to do what was just. The whole of these conditions were therefore superfluous, and in some respects unjust, and they ought to be cut out of the clause.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 16, to leave out from the word 'court,' down to the word 'such' in line 39, and to insert the words 'and shall have regard to.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'sufficient,' in line 19, stand part of the Clause."

Sir W. ROBSON said he was sure hon. Members would see that it was only fair to the Commissioners that there should be something in the nature of general directions as to the principles on which they were to proceed. They were only illustrative, administrative directions and but slightly limited their discretion. For instance, it was laid down in sub-section (*a*) that where it was proposed to carry on a certified efficient school as an elementary school there should be a guarantee for the effective continuance of the school for at least five years. That had to deal with the case of schools which were useful schools for the education of the whole area in which they were placed. Let them suppose there had been an application to the Commissioners to see what was to be done with a school; no arrangement had been come to, and the school had ceased to be an elementary school, and was to be carried on as an efficient school. There the Commissioners had to say that the scheme was not one that could be sanctioned unless a guarantee was given that it should be carried on for five years. Where an application was made with regard to a school of this kind, which would not be in the position of a school receiving a public grant, the Commissioners were very properly directed that no scheme was adequate unless accompanied by such a guarantee. Then, when a local authority was asked to make a payment, why should not payments already received by way of grants or assistance be taken into account? The schools were not self-supporting. They were coming to the public for aid in order that they might be carried on as public schools, and what more reasonable condition could be attached than that those who were fixing the rent should have regard to the public money received by a school? As to the limited nature of the user of the schoolhouse, surely that was a reasonable direction. Obviously it would be very unjust to fix a rent without taking that into account. He suggested that there might be a modification of the rent in cases which approximated to extreme cases. They were not putting any fetters on the Commissioners, but were inviting them to take into consideration the fact that, while the owners of voluntary schools were being relieved of burdens, much of the burden of the trust was being taken over by the local authority.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the hon. and learned Gentleman had not denied that every one of the conditions which his noble friend desired to omit were conditions which would limit the pecuniary considerations given by the public authority to the school. According to the Solicitor-General these were all general, illustrative, and indicative directions, but why were the illustrations all on one side? Why had all the illustrations been unilateral? There were two parties who came before the tribunal, and the House gave directions to the tribunal, all of which were intended to illustrate the procedure to be adopted. But all those illustrations went to diminish the consideration to be given to a school, and all the ingenuity of the Government had failed to discover one illustration which would tend towards the augmentation of the consideration. That was unfair and one-sided treatment. The right hon. Gentleman had over and over again repeated that these Commissioners were to be Judges, who had to consider the procedure of the Court of Chancery, and nothing else. Their duties were to have no administrative character. What was his astonishment, then, to hear the hon. and learned Gentleman say that what the Commission had to consider under subsection (*a*) were the educational necessities of the district. What had these three gentlemen to do with the educational necessities of the district?

SIR W. ROBSON said he did not state that the Commissioners had to consider the educational necessities. What he had said was that the Government had to consider the educational needs of the district, and, therefore, in dealing with any scheme which might be formulated by the Commissioners, they had thought it right that the Commissioners should not treat a proposal to carry on an elementary school as adequate, having regard, of course, to the necessities of the district, unless it was accompanied by a guarantee. That was a very different statement.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he saw no difference at all. The original proposition of the Government reiterated and reiterated was that nothing was to influence the three Judges but the considerations which would influence the Court of Chancery if they were dealing with the trust. Neither the Minister for Education nor the Solicitor-General could say that the Court of Chancery would ever stipulate that the school must be carried on for five years. Sub-section (*a*) was absolutely inconsistent with the repeated pledges of the Minister for Education that these Commissioners should take nothing into account except the law as carried out by the Court of Chancery. His observation with regard to sub-section (*b*) was—what was to be the position of these three great lawyers whom the Government had asked to be Commissioners? Had they merely to consider what would best carry out the intention of the original framers of the trust? Supposing they came to the conclusion that £100 a year rent should be paid and that there should be religious instruction on two days a week, could they order that? No, because their scheme, according to the words of the sub-section, was to be—

"Subject to such conditions (if any) as to payment or other matters as may be agreed to by the local education authority."

The Government proposed to set up a court which was to interpret the trust deeds as a Court of Chancery, but before this Court could give its decision it must consult the local authority, and the local authority was to be supreme. What happened then? Either the Commission would have to modify their decision, or else the scheme must be abortive from the beginning. There was another alternative, which he understood was rejected by the Government, namely, that the local authorities should be obliged to accept the scheme of the Commissioners. Upon that depended the *status* of the three Judges and the fate of the schools with which they were dealing. If the three Commissioners were not to give their own decisions, but were to be influenced by the local authority, where did the impartiality of these Judges come in? If on the other hand the local authority was not to be allowed to interfere at any stage of the proceedings and would have to wait until the final verdict of the court was given, what was going to happen then? The local authority must either accept or refuse. If it accepted then there was an end to the matter, but if it refused what would happen? The Government said one of the objects of this clause was to prevent schools becoming derelict. Upon the face of it, it seemed that the schools must become derelict. He thought at all events that it would be clear from what he had said that if there was no obscurity in the mind of His Majesty's Government there was considerable obscurity in the Bill which they had framed, and that obscurity had in no sense been removed by the answer which the hon. and learned Gentleman had given to his noble friend. The only other point which he needed to dwell upon was the question of whether they ought to diminish the rent according to the amount of denominational religious instruction given in the school. It seemed to him a most astonishing proposition to say that the rent of a school should be diminished according to the amount of religious instruction. He could not himself see the connection between rent and religion. The rent should be determined largely by the advantages which the authorities derived from the school. The school was not worth less to them because religious education was carried on there as well as secular education. Why then should they pay less? A phrase had fallen from the Solicitor-General which had caused some surprise, because it was not to be found in the Bill. It was the phrase "certified efficient school." But the explanation, if singular, was not remote. The Solicitor-General was quoting, not from the Bill, but from the speech in which it was introduced by the Minister for Education. Perhaps the House would permit him to read one or two extracts from that speech. The right hon. Gentleman said—†

> "The Commission will be the authority before which those owners of the school-houses who have not come to terms with the local authority will be carried for the purpose of determining their schemes. In making such schemes 'the Commissioners shall act in accordance with the principles followed by the High Court in exercising the ordinary jurisdiction as to charities inherent in that Court, but they shall not treat the proposal to carry on an elementary school as a proper mode of giving effect to the trusts of the school-house, unless sufficient guarantee is given for the effective continuance of the school as a certified efficient school for a period of at least five years.'"

The right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "A certified efficient school is a school within the law in this sense, that to attend it is to obey the law, but it does not receive any assistance from the rates or taxes."

Then he said—

> "If they are of opinion that the best mode of giving effect to the trust is to allow the local education authority to use the school-house for the purposes of a public elementary school, they may by the scheme require the local education authority to comply with such conditions as to payment, otherwise not being inconsistent with this Act, as they think just."

The hon. and learned Member for Mid. Glamorgan had declared that he voted for this Bill because it embodied the principle of local option. He was mistaken. He voted for the introduction of the Bill knowing that according to the plan of the Minister for Education the decision of the Commissioners was to be obligatory on the local authority. That plan alone would relieve this clause from all its contradictions and inconsistencies, and prevent a local authority from throwing in the face of the Commissioners the scheme which they had prepared. He thought the Committee would feel that some further explanation was desirable from the right hon. Gentleman, more particularly to show how the plan of this clause fitted in with the repeated assurances that the functions of these judges were to be such as might be exercised by the Court of Chancery, carrying out the same law, having the same authority and commanding the same general respect.

MR. BIRRELL said the primary duty of the three Commissioners was to decide the question "Aye" or "No" whether, having regard to the trusts of any particular school brought before them, they had in their opinion no other course than to decide by the principle of equity that they could only fulfil those trusts by continuing it as a public elementary school under the control of the local education authority. That was a judicial duty. The right hon. Gentleman was not particularly well acquainted with the duties of the judges of the Chancery Division, and on that fact he probably ought to be congratulated The Chancery judges having, in the first instance, expressed their opinion on the trusts submitted to them, had constantly, as part of their duty under the Charitable Trusts Acts and other Acts, to frame schemes and to settle terms in accordance with the principles they had laid down.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clv., 1036.

Though it was true, therefore, that their main duty would be the determination of a nice point of law, any one who read the clause and what flowed from their decision, assuming that the school should be transferred, would see that there was an obligation to frame a scheme givng effect to the decision that the Commissioners had already come to. He did not think that there was anything inconsistent in what he had said. While the Commissioners had the duty of interpreting the trusts they might say to a school, "You can go away; your trusts are quite tight, and you cannot possibly be transferred to the local authority." Thus there was an end of the matter, though under the law of *cy prés* the duty was imposed upon them of framing a scheme to give effect to their decision. The noble Lord proposed to strike out the sub-sections in order to leave a free hand to the Commissioners. Having regard to the eminence of the Commissioners, perhaps the words in the sub-section were not absolutely necessary. But as to the building grants which the schools had received, he thought that it was a matter of business that they should be brought fairly to the minds of the Commissioners. When a property was being sold and a price was being asked for it, it surely was not irrelevant that the owners of the schools should be reminded that the public had already contributed towards their support. As to the phrase "certified efficient schools," he said that he intended on the occasion referred to by the right hon. Gentleman to avoid making use of quotation marks; he intended to give a general paraphrase of the words; but when he came to the point his command of language failed him a little, and he read the words from a draft that had been subsequently altered. But the alteration was in favour of the contention of hon. Members opposite, and he did not see why the Government should be blamed for altering the Bill in the interest of a juster clause. The point, however, was as to whether sub-section (*a*) was a fair sub-section. He thought that it was, for reasons already given by the Solicitor-General. The Commissioners were not simply to be told by the representatives of the trustees, "We will keep the school going on our own account." They were to be able to say, "if you are to carry on your school outside the local authority, if you are yourselves to keep it open as an effective school, you must not only say that that is your intention, you must give us some assurance." The word "guarantee" was not a technical term. They were to have an assurance from men of honour that there would be good reason to suppose that the school would be carried on for five years. That would be a guarantee that there were behind the school the means of support. He did not mean to say there must be promises of support on which they could sue for the recovery of money; but there must be a genuine belief and guarantee that there were behind the school persons of sufficient means to secure that the school was likely to continue. Sub-section (*a*) was a reasonable one. A point was made against him; but the noble Lord's Amendment proposed to strike out all those words on which the point arose. The point was that he used language which went to show that, if the Commission had made a scheme and fixed a rent as being a fair and proper rent, it ought to be obligatory upon the local authority. If that were so the acceptance of the noble Lord's Amendment would be the best way to get himself out of that difficulty, which would then disappear altogether. But he was not going to accept it. The proper time to make the clause conformable with his language would be upon an Amendment on that sub-section, and not upon the present Amendment. The difficulties were, of course, with the local authority itself—whether there was the power to enforce a money payment on the local authority. He would like to have time to consider the proposal. He would give the subject his most careful consideration, and if he thought his speech involved an obligation of that kind he would give effect to it.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) said that they had just affirmed in passing sub-section (2) that the Commission was to exercise the jurisdiction of a Court of Chancery, but no sooner had they done so than it was proposed immediately to restrict that very jurisdiction. He thought that was thoroughly unwise, and that the Commission should act completely in accordance with the principles of the Court of Chancery. Otherwise a trusting people might be misled. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education talked of applying *cy prés* doctrine, but he did not understand how that could apply to the present case. He always understood that the Courts could not vary a trust to meet their own views as to what would be for the general advantage of the public. Then there was the question of financial guarantee for the effective continuance of the school for a period of at least five years. To whom was that guarantee to be given? Was it to be given to the local authority? And supposing it was not fulfilled, what then was to be done? Was a new scheme to be made? And what was to happen at the end of the five years? Was there then to be a new scheme? It was supposed that the Commission was to be brought in to settle differences when the owners of a schoolhouse and the local education authority were at loggerheads. But according to the sub-section the local authority was to set the Commission in motion, and then it was to have an absolute veto on its proceedings. He thought that the whole clause was ludicrous, and he could not understand how it could be put into operation with any consistency whatever. There were no other means, therefore, in his opinion, of dealing with the problem before them than by accepting the Amendment now before the Committee.

Mr. WYNDHAM said the Minister for Education had given, not a pledge, but an undertaking to reconsider his attitude when they reached a certain point of sub-section (*b*). He wished to know whether the Minister for Education would include in the promise he had given consideration of the question of facilities, upon which inability to agree would probably more often arise than on the question of rent.

Mr. BIRRELL said he did not think he could give that pledge. Even supposing that he did not keep his promise, in consequence of the opportunity for discussion in Committee not being reached, he adhered to what he had said and would do what he thought he ought to do on the Report stage. The promise did not carry with it the question of facilities.

Mr. WYNDHAM: That re-opens the whole question.

*Mr. R. PEARCE (Staffordshire, Leek) trusted that the Government would not give way at all. There was full security in the clause for fair dealing for all concerned, and it was very important when making schemes which would have the effect of an Act of Parliament and could not be reviewed by any Court that there should be the limitations contained in this clause. He thought that many who were concerned in trusts would welcome those limitations and that their existence would induce them to enter into schemes.

Sir E. CARSON asked whether the Commissioners would be entitled to consider the mortgages and other charges on schools, which had provided the money for building the schools, and to say that they should be discharged by the local authorities. ["Oh."] There was nothing unreasonable in that. There was a good deal of indignation amongst many persons interested in the schools that there would be no rent at all in certain cases.

*The CHAIRMAN said the right hon. Gentleman appeared to be talking of amending this portion of the clause, but the Amendment before the Committee was that it should be left out.

Sir E. CARSON agreed, but said he wanted to know whether he would vote for keeping it in, and that depended upon whether the right hon. Gentleman would put these provisions in an equitable form. If they were left in their present position it appeared to him that they would be unfair, and he should vote for the Amendment of the noble Lord. If the right hon. Gentleman was, however, prepared to make the provisions more equitable he should advise his noble friend not to go to a division on this Amendment. It was, therefore, of considerable importance that they should know what the Government were going to do. With regard to the right hon. Gentleman's statement as to the Commissioners' acting in accordance with the principles of the Court of Chancery, he thought he ought to say a word in defence of the Court of Chancery. To describe the functions of the Commissioners as being analogous to those of the Court of Chancery was grotesque. They would have no more connection with the principles of the Court of Chancery than the right hon. Gentleman or the Solicitor-General had when they answered Questions in this House on points of law.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the business.

Whereupon Mr. BIRRELL rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (York, E.R., Holderness): Did not the right hon. Gentleman rise after eleven o'clock?

*__THE CHAIRMAN__: The right hon. Gentleman rose at the moment of interruption of business.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 320 ; Noes, 151. (Division List No. 190.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, JosephA.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, JohnEmmott(Somers't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, J. H.(Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.(Bedfordshire
Bolton, T.D.(Derbyshire,N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWmJ.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley,William J.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W.Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dodd, W. H.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborouh)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Right. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget

Helme, Norval Watson
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs.
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. H.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts., Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John(Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas(W. Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowdon, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Enward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H(Somerset, E
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord(Norfolk, Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T(Hudd'rsfi'd

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay(Galw'y
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(LanarkGovan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn.Col. W.
Kilbride, Denis
King, SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lee, ArthurH(Hants.,Fareham
Long, Col.Charles W.(Evesham
Lundon, W.
Lyttleton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Kean, John
M'Kilop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W.Mitchell (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES. — Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out, to the word 'sufficient,' in line 19, stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 320 ; Noes, 150. (Division List No. 191.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Asquith, Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.

Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, J.H.(Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Bolton, T. D.(Derbyshire,N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davis, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dodd, W. H.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hokpinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras,E.
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lever,A. Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. H.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norman, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C.(Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price, Robert John(Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Rt.Hn.E. (Dundee)

Robertson,Sir G Scott(Bradf'rd
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowdon, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H. (Somerset,E
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White George (Norfolk)
White, J. D.(Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wison, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse,Lord(Norfolk,Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Hudd'rsf'd.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn SirAlex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arnold-Forster,Rt Hn Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick Georg
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Delany, William
Devlin,Charles Ramsay(Galway
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt, W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hammond, John
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Kilbride, Denis
King,Sir HenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lawl Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham.
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham.
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Lord Robert Cecil and Mr. Arkwright.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL.

Order for the House to be put into Committee read.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said that in reference to this Bill, he had had some consultation with his hon. friend the Member for Bolton, who had met him in a very reasonable spirit, and said that if the Government would take the responsibility of conducting the Bill through the House his opposition to it would cease. He thought that was a very fair and reasonable offer on the part of the hon. Gentleman, and as he had received an intimation that the Government would take responsibility for the Bill, he hoped hon. Members would allow the Committee stage to be taken.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) said hitherto he had objected to the Bill on the ground that any such departure in the criminal law as was therein contemplated ought not to be made on the initiative of a private Member, and after eleven o'clock. If he received an assurance from the Government that they accepted responsibility for the Bill he should no longer maintain his objection.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (MR. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The view of the Government on this Bill is well known. We are extremely anxious to see it passed into law. I have put down some Amendments which we think are desirable, and I do hope the House will consent to take the Committee stage.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): I object.

The consideration of the Bill was, thereupon, deferred.

And, it being half-past Eleven of the clock, MR. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at half after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 5th July, 1906.

EARLDOM OF NORFOLK.

A witness ordered to attend the Committee for Privileges this day and produce documents.

EARLDOM OF NORFOLK.

Committee for Privileges met: Counsel further heard on behalf of the claimant, Lord Mowbray: A witness examined: Counsel heard to open the case on behalf of the Duke of Norfolk: Committee adjourned till To-morrow.

LORD GRAVES (CLAIM TO VOTE FOR REPRESENTATIVE PEERS FOR IRELAND).

Ordered, that all deeds, documents, and papers produced on behalf of the Petitioner by his agent be delivered to the said agent.

WORCESTER ELECTION.

The Lord Steward acquainted the House that His Majesty had appointed To-morrow, at Buckingham Palace, to receive the Address of both Houses on the said election: A message sent to the Commons to inform them thereof, and that the Lords had appointed the Lord Steward and the Captain of the Gentlemen-at Arms to present the Address on the part of this House, and to desire the Commons to appoint a proportionate number of its Members to present the said Address with their Lordships.

SAT FIRST.

The Earl of Romney sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Cardiff Gas Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Dover Harbour (Works, etc.,) Bill [H.L.]. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported, with Amendments.

Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway Bill [H.L.]; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Cork City Railways and Works Bill. Moved, That the Order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to. Bill read 2^a and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Midland Railway Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments; further Amendments made. Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

Uxbridge Gas Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Brought from the Commons. Read 1^a, and referred to the Examiners.

Bury Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons, agreed to, with Amendments.

Clacton Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Newport Harbour Commissioners Bill [H.L.]; Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund) Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield District Railway Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Kettering Water Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to.

Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill. Message from the Commons to acquaint this House that they have made the following Order, to which they desire the concurrence of their Lordships:

Ordered, That the promoters of the Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill which has been introduced into this House in the present session of Parliament shall have leave to suspend any further proceedings thereon

[*An Asterisk* (*) *at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*]

in order to proceed with the same Bill, if they shall think fit, in the next session of Parliament, provided that notice of their intention to do so be lodged in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on the day prior to the close of the present session, and that all fees due thereon up to that period be paid.

That the money deposited in accordance with the Standing Orders of this House in respect of such Bill may thereupon be returned to the depositors.

That the promoters of such Bill may, on or before the 31st day of December next, deposit in the Private Bill Office an estimate, signed by the person making the same, of the expense of the undertaking under the Bill, and, previously to the 15th day of January next, deposit a sum not less than five per centum on the amount of such estimate with the Paymaster General.

That such Bill shall be referred to the Examiners, who shall certify whether or not the promoters have made such deposit with the Paymaster-General, and, upon the Examiners certifying that such deposit has been made, that the proceedings on such Bill shall be *pro forma* only in regard to all other stages through which the same shall have passed in the present session, and no new fees shall be charged in regard to such stages.

That such Bill shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office not later than six o'clock on or before the third day on which the House shall sit in the next session of Parliament, with a declaration annexed thereto signed by the agent stating that the Bill is the same in every respect as the Bill at the last stage of the proceedings thereon in this House in the present session.

That if the money deposited in the present session, as required by Standing Order No. 57, in respect of such Bill has not been withdrawn as provided for by the preceding resolutions, a certificate of that fact from the proper officer of the Court in which such money was deposited shall accompany such declaration, and such Bill shall not be referred to the Examiners.

That such Bill, indorsed by one of the Clerks in the Private Bill Office as having been duly deposited with such declaration and such certificate, if any, annexed, be laid by one of the Clerks of that Office upon the Table of the House in the next session of Parliament.

That such Bill, so laid upon the Table, shall be deemed to have been read a first time.

That the Standing Orders by which the proceedings on Bills are regulated shall not apply to such Bill in regard to any of the stages through which the same shall have passed during the present session.

That all petitions presented in the present session against such Bill shall stand referred to the Committee on the Bill in the next session of Parliament, and that all notices and grounds of objections to the right of petitioners to be heard, given in the present session within the time prescribed by the Rules of the Referees relating to such notices, shall be held applicable in the next session of Parliament.

That no petitioners shall be heard before the Committee on such Bill unless their petition shall have been presented within the time limited in the present session or in respect of which Standing Order No. 128 has been dispensed with in the present session, or unless their Petition shall be presented on or before the 12th day of February 1907.

Ordered, That this Order be a Standing Order of the House.

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.] Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.] Amendments reported (according to Order); and Bills to be read 3^a To-morrow.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION.

Petitions in favour of denominational religious teaching in schools, of parents and guardians of children attending schools at Patricroft; Ashton-under Lyne; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WORCESTER ELECTION.

The Lord Steward to attend His Majesty with the Address on the part of this House in the place of the Lord Chamberlain.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

List of boroughs and urban districts in England and Wales with a population of five thousand and upwards in which there are no council schools.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3663. Turkey (Baghdad).

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

LUNACY.

Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made and the numbers of patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ended 30th June 1906.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury minutes, dated 28th June 1906—Declaring that for the due and efficient discharge of the duties of the office of Keeper of the National Gallery of British Art at Millbank professional or other peculiar qualifications not ordinarily to be acquired on the public service are required; declaring that Leonardo de Santo, foreman, His Majesty's Office of Works, Constantinople, was appointed without a civil service certificate through inadvertance on the part of the head of his department.

FINES, ETC. (IRELAND).

Abstract of Account of Fines accounted for by the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks, for the year 1904.

DOGS REGULATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1865.

Accounts of receipts and expenditure under the Act, for the year 1905.

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP).

Fifteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under Section 29 of the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890.

LAND REGISTRY.

Account of receipts and payments in respect of the land registry, for the year ended 31st March 1906.

POST OFFICE (MONEY ORDERS, INLAND).

The Postal Order (Inland) Amendment (No. 1) Regulations, 1906, dated 22nd June 1906.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE AND COURT OF APPEAL, ETC.

Account prepared in pursuance of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1875, showing the receipts and expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal during the year ended the 31st March 1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Message from the Commons for leave for the Clerk of the Parliaments to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of that House: Leave given accordingly, and a message ordered to be sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS BILL.

House in Committee (according to order).

Bill reported without Amendment; and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

CONVEYANCING BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The Earl of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

LORD DAVEY: My Lords, this Bill has been very carefully considered by a Select Committee appointed by your Lordships, and some Amendments have been made by the Select Committee. I beg to move that the Amendments so made be introduced into the Bill.

Moved, "That the Amendments proposed by the Select Committee be made."—(*Lord Davey*).

On question, Motion agreed to.

LORD DAVEY: This Bill, as I have already informed your Lordships, has been very carefully and fully considered by the Select Committee, and probably your Lordships will, therefore, think this a case in which the Standing Committee may be properly negatived. I beg to move.

Moved, "That the Standing Committee be negatived."—(*Lord Davey*).

On question, Motion agreed to.

The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

SETTLED LAND BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

LORD DAVEY: My Lords, in this case also the Bill has been considered by the Select Committee to whom the measure which we have just disposed of was referred, and some Amendments were made. I therefore beg to move that those Amendments be introduced into the Bill.

Moved, "That the Amendments proposed by the Select Committee be made." —(*Lord Davey*).

On question, Motion agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

LORD DAVEY: This Bill has also been considered by the same Select Committee and Amendments have been introduced. I move that those Amendments be accepted.

Moved, "That the Amendments proposed by the Select Committee be made." —(*Lord Davey*).

On question, Motion agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received To-morrow.

THE MANNING OF THE MERCANTILE MARINE.

LORD BRASSEY rose to call attention to the increasing numbers of foreigners and Asiatics serving in British ships as shown in the latest Returns; and to the Reports of recent Departmental Committees on the manning of merchant ships and on Naval Reserves, making recommendations as to the training of boys for the sea service, on which no action has yet been taken.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the manning of the mercantile marine, and the need for further means of training. I have confidence that your Lordships will give favourable consideration to suggestions having for their aim the securing of a supply of well-trained British seamen for our vast mercantile marine. Our shipping rivals in tonnage the combined merchant navies of the world. When we turn to the manning of our ships, as shown in the latest Returns, we see to our regret that the crews required for our increasing tonnage consist in ever-growing proportions of foreigners. In the ten years 1894–1904, the number of British persons in ships belonging to the United Kingdom fell from 183,000 to 177,000. Lascars and Asiatics increased from 26,000 to 43,000, and foreigners from 31,000 to 40,000, or from 17 to 23 per cent. of the total number. The figures for the last six years are ominous for the future. Lascars have increased by 6,000, foreigners by 4,500, British seamen and firemen by 2,000. There are various causes for the increasing employment of foreigners. The point on which I now desire to insist is this: that in the opinion of many authorities, including all the superintendents of the Board of Trade who appeared before Lord St. Helier's Committee, there are not enough capable British seamen to man the mercantile marine. The sailing-ships, and especially the small coasting vessels—formerly our best nursery for seamen—are disappearing. New means of training are required. Every Royal Commission and Committee on Manning has recommended the establishment of training ships.

The first Report to which I shall refer will be that of the Commission on Manning. It was appointed in 1859. Its recommendations in their main features stand good for to-day. Lord Cardwell was a member of the Commission. His name is chiefly associated with reforms in the Army. It is less generally known that the Navy owes to his initiative the recommendations of the Manning Commission in favour of continuous service. There was a further recommendation, to which I desire especially to call attention, also made on the initiative of Lord Cardwell. As the best means of creating reserves for the Navy and providing for the manning of the mercantile marine, the Commission recommended the establishment of school ships. They describe a practical and well-considered scheme. I will not enter into details. If Parliament approves of State-aided training for seamen the management will be with the Board of Trade. The total cost of training should not exceed £60 per head, including an ample amount for premiums to shipowners. Nor should the numbers be more than sufficient to give a supply of 1,000 to 2,000 well-trained men. The cost should be charged to the Votes for technical education. The State would be fully compensated, indirectly, by the improved manning of our merchant service; directly, by the reinforcement of the Naval Reserves, and by utilising the schools at the Ports for the training of boys for the Navy. As a result of their recommendations, the Manning Commission anticipated considerable economy in the training establishments of the Navy, and, further, the creation of those kindly feelings between boys destined for both services which it is of the utmost importance to encourage.

I pass on to the Report of the Commission on Unseaworthy Ships. It was appointed in 1874. The Duke of Somerset was Chairman; the Duke of Edinburgh and Mr. Milner Gibson were members. Efficient manning being an essential condition of safety at sea, the Commission, in their final Report, called attention to the deficiency in the supply of seamen. They recommended strongly the adoption of the plan proposed by the Manning Commission. Recommendations in favour of training-ships were renewed by the Committee on the Manning of the Merchant Service appointed by the Board of Trade in 1894. The Chairman of the Committee was Sir Edward Reed. Among its members were Mr. Forwood, Secretary to the Admiralty; Sir Digby Murray, for many years the able nautical advisor of the Board of Trade; and Mr. Havelock Wilson, M.P., secretary and founder of the National Seamen's Union. The Commission dealt at length with the training of seamen. They thought it—

> "extremely desirable that training ships or schools, with a small vessel attached, should be established at many ports round the coast, where boys, intending to adopt the sea as a profession, could obtain the necessary rudimentary technical instruction."

The manning question has recently been examined by Committees appointed in 1902 by the Board of Trade and the Admiralty. The late Lord St. Helier was Chairman of the Board of Trade Committee. Shipowners were represented by Mr. Anderson, shipbuilders by Colonel Denny, labour by Mr. Burt and Mr. Havelock Wilson. The Committee made those recommendations for the amelioration of the lot of the sailor which have been embodied in the Merchant Shipping Bill. They dealt also with the training of seamen. As the best means of increasing the number, they recommended that every encouragement should be given to training ships and to the training of boys on merchant vessels.

I turn lastly to the Committee on Naval Reserves, appointed by the Admiralty. Sir Edward Grey was the Chairman, and with him were associated Admirals Sir Edward Seymour and Hedworth Lambton, Sir Francis Mowatt and Sir Alfred Jones. The Committee were of opinion that the establishment of training ships for boys should be encouraged, but not paid for by the Admiralty.

The inquiries to which I have referred extend over a long period. Able statesmen and administrators, assisted by men of the widest experience as shipowners or in the command of ships, have been engaged in these inquiries. They have been unanimous in their recommendations. The statistics which I have quoted show that the time for action has come. It would be well to begin by giving aid to existing institutions. In the Port of London we have the Marine Society. Their training ship the "Warspite," has a long and a good record, largely due to the part which a succession of naval officers have taken in the management. For the Port of Liverpool a sea-training home has recently been established by a few public-spirited owners, among whom Sir Alfred Jones has taken a leading part. Training should be gradually extended to the principal ports, as recommended by Sir Edward Reed's Committee. The homes should be on the model of the Admiralty school at Greenwich, but on a smaller scale.

In this country we are generally prompt to take action when a foreign country gives us a lead. In the United States it has been necessary to create training establishments. Barracks have been erected for the training of recruits and apprentices to the sea, at Newport, San Francisco, and on the great lakes. There will be objections in certain quarters to State aid for the training of seamen. It will be contended by some that the shipowners are not entitled to such assistance, by others that the merchant service will be distasteful to well-trained boys. I have already shown that the training of seamen would be for the public advantage. If men are well treated they will not leave their employment. There are other considerations beyond those of utility. If in foreign countries means exist for the training of seamen, if under the liberal regulations of the French *Inscription Maritime* inducements are offered to follow the sea as a calling, which in our own country are lacking, and if, as the result, sailors increase under foreign flags and diminish under the British flag, and the manning of our ships falls more and more to the foreigner, it will be a change tending to lower this country as a maritime Power.

I close with the words borrowed from Lord St. Helier's report —

> "It would be impossible not to feel great regret if we thought that foreigners were driving out British subjects. The feeling of regret would not be the less real even if it was based on patriotic and even sentimental, rather than on strictly economic, grounds. If by a great increase in the number of foreign seamen in its mercantile marine, the characteristics of the British as a sea-going race should gradually deteriorate, it would be impossible to regard such a change with acquiescence or equanimity."

The Returns placed in our hands by the Board of Trade are giving timely warning. We must, as other nations have done, take in hand the training of seamen. When we consider that the fate of our country is in her Fleet and Merchant Navy, that the earnings of our shipping have been estimated at over £90,000,000, and that the number of men employed in shipping is greater than in any other industry except agriculture, and further consider the incalculable benefits to trade and commerce resulting from economy of transportation through the keen competition among shipowners, the cost of any scheme of training must appear a light burden, and the advantages more than commensurate.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, I do not think that there is any Member of your Lordships' House who will not agree with me when I say that there cannot be two opinions as to the desirability of increasing the number of British sailors in British ships, and I think every effort should be made to attain such an end. The noble Lord has given us some figures with regard to the number of British, Foreign, and Asiatic sailors serving on British ships between the years 1894–1904, and during those years there is no qnestion that the number of British seamen has tended to decrease; but I am glad to inform your Lordships that this decrease has now been arrested, and if we turn to the figures for 1905, we find that in that year there were employed on British ships 180,492 British seamen, 39,711 foreigners, and 43,483 Lascars and Asiatics, against 176,975 British seamen, 39,832 foreign, and 42,682 Lascars in 1904. Consequently, your Lordships will perceive that the number of British seamen employed in 1905 reached a higher figure by some thousands than it has reached since 1894. The number of Lascars is still increasing, but I feel your Lordships will agree with the noble Lord that these men are on a totally different footing from the foreigner; they are mostly British subjects and excellent seamen.

The noble Lord calls attention to the Reports of various Commissions, one of the Reports dating back to the year 1859. The Manning Commission of that year proposed the establishment of twelve State supported training ships for the purpose of training boys for the Navy and mercantile marine. Those who entered the latter were to be enrolled in the Navy reserve and to be employed in the coasting trade mainly. But this scheme was really intended to provide a reserve for the Navy. The Commission on Unseaworthy Ships, of which the noble Lord was a member, did not go very deeply into the subject, but they favoured State grants to training ships. The Manning Committee of 1894 favoured the establishment ot training ships by the

State, but the Reports of the Mercantile Marine Committee of 1903 and the Naval Reserves Committee of 1902 do not appear to have been so favourable to the proposal, as it would appear from the noble Lord's remarks. The Mercantile Marine Committee, while in favour of every encouragement being given to training ships, were of opinion that—

> "an increase in the number of British seamen in the mercantile marine may be looked for rather in an improvement of their conditions than in the increase of facilities for training boys for the sea,"

and they were also of the opinion—

> "that there is a better prospect of obtaining an increase of British seamen by means of the employment of boy sailors than by means of training ships."

I may here say that I think His Majesty's Government have gone a long way in the direction of improving the comfort of the sailor by the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Bill now before the other House. A good food scale is to be made compulsory; the inspection of provisions is to be extended; the accommodation is to be increased to 120 cubic feet; ships of over 1,000 tons must carry a certificated cook; and there are other Amendments. The noble Lord has also quoted from the Report of the Naval Reserves Committee, but I will not trouble your Lordships with any remarks with regard to that.

I now turn to the question of State aid, and any scheme on the lines in aid of training ships depends, of course, on the amount of aid given, and I very much fear that any scheme of this sort, to have any appreciable effect, would mean a very considerable additional expense. I understand that a boy on a training ship costs from £20 to £25 a year. The Manning Commission of 1859 estimated the cost of twelve training ships at £40,000 a year, and the total cost of their scheme at £200,000 a year. I am led to believe that in many of the training ships at present in existence, it is found very difficult to get the boys to sea on leaving these ships. The noble Lord suggests that premiums should be paid to shipowners during the first two years served by boys at sea. Here, again, I fear there would be additional expense. There is another grave difficulty, and it is this: If the State spend money on training ships it is essential that there should be some guarantee that the boys will not leave the sea service after the first year at sea, and I confess that this appears to me to present the greatest difficulty.

The noble Lord suggests that His Majesty's Government should begin by giving aid to the "Warspite," and the Liscard Sea Training Home, but such a course would appear to me to be open to grave objections, as it would be giving preferential treatment to one or two institutions. I may, perhaps, be permitted to say that His Majesty's Government have the very greatest sympathy with the object the noble Lord has in view, that British ships should as far as possible be manned by men of British nationality; and the President of the Board of Trade decided some time ago to appoint a Departmental Committee—

> "To consider and report upon the most practicable scheme for the supply and training of boy seamen of British nationality for the mercantile marine."

I am glad to be able to inform your lordships that the President has been able to secure the co-operation of distinguished representatives of the several interests concerned. This Committee has been appointed, and the chair will be taken by Mr. Kearley, Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade. I may also say here, on behalf of the Board of Trade, how very grateful they would be if the noble Lord would give them the advantage of his great experience by giving evidence before the Committee. I am particularly sanguine that the results of the deliberations of this Committee will be of the greatest value to the subject raised by the noble Lord; and if any workable scheme can be evolved—and I feel confident it can be—His Majesty's Government will, I am sure, give effect to any recommendations brought to their notice by so representative a body as the one just appointed. In conclusion, I must thank your Lordships for the kind consideration you have given to me in listening to what I am afraid has been a somewhat long statement.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, my excuse for rising to say a few words on this occasion is that I have brought this subject very often before your Lordships' notice. What my noble friend has just said has been very much like the general reply I have received from those representing the Marine Department of the Board of Trade, with this exception, that he has told us that the Government are fully in sympathy with the desirability of manning the merchant service with British subjects. The noble Earl referred to the new Departmental Committee as likely to be of great value, but I must say I distrust it thoroughly. I am led to that conclusion from the result of former Departmental Committees, which really have not done any good at all. When the Merchant Shipping Bill comes up to your Lordships' House and we have an opportunity of discussing it, and, I trust, of inserting some Amendments, I hope some good will result.

I do not think any one on either side of the House will deny that it is a serious evil that there should be such a large foreign element in our merchant service. We have been told that if we could indicate any means of remedying that evil, our suggestions would be considered. When you are dealing with a matter of this importance you naturally take the line of least resistance. There are nearly 40,000 foreign seamen in our merchant service, and 511 foreign captains and officers. Which is easier, to legislate for the 40,000 foreign seamen or the 511 foreign captains and officers? According to my noble friend Lord Brassey, the Report of the Superintendents of the Board of Trade was to the effect that enough competent seamen to enter our merchant service could not be found. When men entering the merchant service find themselves placed under alien captains and alien officers, I contend that that is enough to discourage any young fellow who is fond of his country and proud of his profession, and I think that if you insist that British ships are to be commanded and officered by British subjects there will be no occasion for State aid. The men will be forthcoming without it. There are one or two matters in which concessions might be made to shipowers, such as light dues, which would not be much loss to the country. I am sure that if our merchant ships were officered by British subjects there would be no difficulty in getting seamen of our own nationality.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Do I understand that the Departmental Committee will be confined to the consideration of the most practicable scheme for the supply and training of boy seamen of British nationality.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: That is so, according to the terms of reference.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I presume that this Committee will sit at once.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: The names of the Members will appear in to-morrow's papers, and the Committee will begin to sit immediately.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I think the chief difficulty is to get British sailors to remain in British ships after they have been trained for the sea. They will not live in the present dirty dog-holes, mixed up with a number of foreigners of the lowest class, and with their wages sometimes withheld for twelve months. They are, indeed, the only people who are liable to have their wages withheld in this way. I think these points can be better dealt with in the Merchant Shipping Bill, which will shortly be before us, and all that I am rising for is to ask noble Lords opposite to use their influence with the gentlemen who sit in another place to send that Bill up to this House as soon as possible, so that we may have ample time for discussing it and not have it crowded out by the Education Bill. I have several Amendments which I am afraid may take up a little of your Lordships' time, but all of them are in the direction of increasing the comfort of seamen, and, therefore, of their retention in British ships.

THE BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE rose to call attention to the list of measures enumerated in His Majesty's gracious Speech on the occasion of the opening of Parliament; and to ask whether His Majesty's Government were able to give any information as to the time at which those measures, or any of them, were likely to be brought before this House.

The noble Marquess said: My Lords, I make no apology for addressing to the noble Marquess opposite the Question which I have put upon the Paper. I need not say that I ask it from no idle curiosity, nor do I ask it merely in the interest of this House. I ask it on the broadest public grounds. I have said in my Notice that I will call attention to the list of measures enumerated in the gracious Speech from the Throne at the beginning of the session. Let me remind your Lordships what those measures were. That part of the Speech in which legislative proposals are dealt with begins with the announcement that His Majesty's Government—

> "have under consideration plans for improving and effecting economies in the system of government in Ireland and for introducing into it means for associating the people with the conduct of Irish affairs."

Immediately afterwards comes the statement that—

> "the social and economic conditions of the rural districts in Great Britain require careful consideration;'

and that—

> "inquiries are proceeding as to the means by which a larger number of the population may be attracted to and retained on the soil."

And we are told that these inquiries will be completed at no distant date. These statements stop short of a positive announcement of legislation. They are, if I may say so, of a somewhat nebulous character; and I shall assume, unless the noble Marquess opposite contradicts me, that neither of the measures thus broadly sketched out is, so far as this year at all events is concerned, likely to be heard of in Parliament.

I pass on to the list of measures which are categorically promised. First comes a Bill for amending the existing law with regard to education. Then Bills are promised dealing with trade disputes, with the amendment of the Workmen's Compensation Acts, with the further equalisation of rates in the Metropolis, and for amending the Unemployed Workmen Act. We are also told that the attention of Parliament will be called to measures dealing with the Merchant Shipping Law, to measures for amending and extending the Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Act, for amending the Labourers (Ireland) Act, for checking commercial corruption, for improving the law regarding certain Colonial marriages, for abolishing the property qualification required of County Justices in England, and for the prevention of plural voting in Parliamentary elections.

That is, I think I may say, a momentous programme of legislation for a single session of Parliament, and it is interesting to consider how many courses of this great legislative feast have up to the present time appeared on the Table of your Lordship's House. The measures which I have enumerated are, I think, a dozen in number. I should say, roughly speaking, that seven of them are of first-rate importance, and the other five, though certainly not without importance, are rather of the second rank. During the five months that have passed since we met at the beginning of the session, your Lordships' have had before you only three of those twelve measures, all three belonging to what I ventured to describe a moment ago as the second rank. I refer to the Bill dealing with commercial corruption, the Bill dealing with Colonial marriages, and the Bill dealing with the qualification of Justices of the Peace. We have also had before us a Bill not mentioned in the gracious Speech dealing with the important question of criminal appeal. The position is this: There still remain two of the measures of lesser importance, and the whole of the seven larger measures, none of which has so far come near this House; and my object in asking this Question is to endeavour to elicit from the noble Marquess what opportunities of considering this long series of important Bills the House of Lords is likely to be given during the course of the present year.

We have not infrequently had complaints of the manner in which business has been brought before this House. I have felt myself bound to admit with the noble Marquess opposite, that on frequent occasions the House of Lords has been put into a very undignified position owing to the practice of bringing up important Bills in the last days, or even in the last hours of the session, when it was quite impossible to examine them as they deserved to be examined.

But, my Lords, what have been the reasons which have made this unfortunate practice to some extent inevitable? I think there have been three reasons. In the first place, it has always been usual to introduce important Bills in the House of Commons; in the next place, the House of Commons has, as years went by, shown a greater and greater desire to spend a considerable time in the discussion of such

Bills; and, in the third place, the difficulty has been occasioned by the universal desire of Members of both Houses to get away from London when the summer weather became hot and unpleasant. I put it upon that ground because I desire to dispute the correctness of the time-honoured theory which explains the date of the prorogation with reference to the commencement of the grouse shooting season. I have an idea that the Houses of Parliament will be found to contain a large majority of gentlemen who perhaps have never seen a grouse, and who certainly would not hit a grouse if they saw one; and it is entirely erroneous to ascribe our hurry to terminate our proceedings to a desire to take part in that admirable field sport.

This year, my Lords, that difficulty does not arise, for we are to have an autumn session. I, for one, am certainly not going to complain of the decision of His Majesty's Government. I have always believed that there was a great deal to be said in favour of habitual autumn sessions. To my mind the only serious objection to them is that they encroach upon the one period of the year when hard-worked Ministers and hard-worked public officers are able to devote themselves steadily, and without interruption, to the preparation of the measures which have to be considered in Parliament the following year. But, so far as what I may call the lay members of this House are concerned, I do not believe that many of us would object to autumn sessions, but upon one condition, and upon one condition only, and that is that at the end of the autumn session we should not be placed in the same embarrassing and undignified position as we have sometimes been placed in at the end of the summer session. We have, therefore, I venture to think, a right to ask His Majesty's Government what steps they are taking in order to secure the work of this House being properly distributed during the months that lie before us.

Now, may I be permitted for a moment to take stock of the work that lies ahead of us. There is, in the first place, the Education Bill. The noble Marquess, the Leader of the House, has been good enough to intimate privately to me that we cannot expect to take that Bill until the 31st of this month. We shall receive it, so to speak, red-hot from the House of Commons. We shall have very little opportunity of considering the alterations which it may have undergone during the last days of its discussion, and we shall have to choose between a very hurried debate in the early days of August and a prolongation of the session further into that month. The first Question, therefore, which I wish to ask the noble Marquess is this: Are we to take it that July 31st, is really the earliest day on which we can have the Bill, and, in addition to that, may we understand that we shall certainly have it on that day, and that we shall not find at the last moment that the date of its consideration is still further relegated into the month of August?

The second Question which I desire to ask is whether there is any prospect of any other Bills beside the Education Bill coming to us before we adjourn for the summer holidays. In the third place, I wish to ask whether His Majesty's Government have yet decided at what date in the month of October they desire to call Parliament together again. The fourth Question which I have to ask is, I think, more important still—namely, whether His Majesty's Ministers have formed any idea or can give any sketch of the manner in which the remainder of the session, including the autumn session, is to be turned to account.

I will assume for the sake of argument that we meet in the middle of October and sit until the middle of December. That would give us, roughly speaking, about thirty-six Parliamentary days according to the ordinary custom of this House. Has the noble Marquess conferred with his colleagues in the House of Commons, and is he able to tell us with any confidence that during that time, or approximately that time, there is any prospect of each of the two Houses of Parliament being able to deal satisfactorily with the long series of important measures which I enumerated to the House just now? Even if it be assumed, and I do not know whether I am right in assuming it, that His Majesty's Government intend to take up the whole time of the House of Commons after the holidays, I would still like to know where the House of Lords comes in.

If we try and project our minds into the autumn months, the prospect seems to me to be of the most appalling character.

Take the Education Bill. It is quite clear that the Second Reading debate, for the reason I gave a moment ago, must be in some respects a somewhat hurried and unsatisfactory discussion. A considerable number of the provisions of the Bill will come here without having been discussed at all in the House of Commons. Now, is it not perfectly obvious in these circumstances that if the House consents to read the Bill a second time it will be the duty of the House of Lords to examine it and to discuss it very thoroughly indeed? I go further. It seems to me inconceivable that a Bill, the Parliamentary history of which has been that which I have just attempted to give, should pass through this House entirely without amendment. We should abdicate our position as a chamber of revision if we did not discuss the Bill with the object and with the intention of amending it wherever amendment might prove to be necessary. Is it not also conceivable that there may be some want of agreement between the two Houses as to Amendments so inserted, and, if so, does it not follow that that Bill at all events will make a very large inroad upon the Parliamentary time of both Houses?

I will merely refer in the fewest possible words to the remaining Bills. The Trade Disputes Bill has not yet been through Committee of the other House. I may remind the noble Marquess that with the support and approval of His Majesty's Government a Second Reading was given to a rival Bill dealing with the same subject; so that there is not one Bill, but two, which will have to be examined and considered. The Workmen's Compensation Bill is of a highly technical character. It took three days for the First and Second Reading, and was no less than twelve days under examination before the Standing Committee on Law. It has not yet been through Committee of the House of Commons. That obviously is a Bill which must take some time to discuss. The promised Bill for the equalisation of rates has not even been introduced. The Merchant Shipping Bill has not yet been through Committee of the House of Commons. That Bill is one in regard to which, as we have seen from the discussion that has just taken place, we may expect important debates. The Plural Voting Bill has not been through Committee of the House of Commons I understand that the drafting of the measure has been very severely criticised, and it is at any rate one of an extremely controversial character. The Crofters Bill has not been introduced, and the Labourers (Ireland) Bill has still to go through Committee.

Then I come to the Unemployed Bill. That Bill has not been even introduced, but I understand that a statement of the policy of His Majesty's Government upon the subject is likely to be made before long in the House of Commons. I want to say one word, and, if I may, to strike a note of warning with regard to the Unemployed Bill. I do trust that that Bill will not be thrown upon the Table of this House late in the winter, at a time when it would be impossible for us adequately to examine it. That would be a moment when, if there is any serious amount of unemployment and any apprehension of difficulty during the winter, it would be most unfortunate that this House should have the appearance of obstructing or putting difficulties in the way of a Bill dealing with the subject of unemployment.

I have said nothing of so-called Departmental Bills, of which I presume there must be a certain number; nor have I made any allowance for any private Members' Bills which His Majesty's Government may determine to take up; but I ask your Lordships whether the *résumé* of the situation I have given is not one which may well give us some cause for apprehension. I therefore do beg the noble Marquess opposite, if he can do so, to give us some information as to the plan which he and his colleagues have before them for the remainder of the session. The noble Marquess has always been a vigorous champion of the rights of this House, and I would venture to remind him of a discussion which took place here two years ago when he complained, not without reason, I think, of the treatment of this House, and made suggestions for the improvement of a state of things which we all admitted to be unsatisfactory. The noble Marquess then suggested, in the first place, that more Bills ought to originate in the House of Lords—an excellent suggestion—and he went on to say that, in his opinion, Government Bills were kept on the Order Paper of the House of Commons long after they had any chance of passing, and his advice was that the Order Paper should be cleared earlier of such Bills. I trust that the noble Marquess will maintain the principles he advocated in 1904, and apply them to the present situation. I hope he will give us the information which we seek, and that he will, at any rate, be able to tell us that we shall not be asked to superimpose upon an ordinary session of the usual length a second session in the autumn, only to find that at the end of it we are called upon to discuss precipitately and with indecent haste measures which it has been impossible for us to consider properly. I beg to ask the Question standing in my name.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess OF RIPON): My Lords, I am glad my noble friend who has just sat down recognises that I have always been a champion of the rights of this House; but the noble Marquess must recollect that I have always been very pessimistic in the matter. On the occasion to which he has alluded I did not express any large hope as to the possibilities of greatly altering the condition of affairs of which we were all inclined to complain. One of the propositions which I made on that occasion—namely, that more Bills should be introduced in this House—I distinctly said could only be carried out by a Conservative Government. I did say that when the Conservatives were sitting on this side of the House they could introduce Bills here in the first instance which it would be impossible for a Liberal Government to introduce. I adhere to that opinion, although I spoke on that occasion to the winds, and did not observe the slightest inclination on the part of noble Lords opposite when they sat on this side of the House to take the advice which I humbly tendered to them.

I am quite ready to answer, as far as I can, the Question which has been put to me by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition. I am not surprised that my noble friend should put this Question, and I make no complaint whatever of his having done so. At the same time I do think that his inquiries would have been more appropriate if made, not at the end of a part of a session, but at the end of a real end of a session, when the prorogation is pending. As regards the Education Bill, I quite agree as to the importance of that measure; and I am quite as desirous as the noble Marquess opposite is, and as anyone in this House can be, that the Bill when it comes here should be carefully and fully discussed. I am sorry that the Bill cannot get here before the 30th of this month. That, I believe is the arrangement in the House of Commons in connection with what is called the guillotine—an institution of which I am no admirer, but which I am afraid has come to stay amongst us. I am afraid that the Education Bill cannot be read a third time in the House of Commons before July 30th.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The 30th or the 31st?

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: It cannot be read a third time in the House of Commons until the 30th, and I desire to confer with my noble friend as to what would be the best course to take with it when it has passed the other House. I have looked into the course which was pursued by noble Lords opposite when they were in office in 1902. They then had an Education Bill. That Bill was finally discussed in an autumn session. The course taken with regard to it was this: it passed the House of Commons at about midnight on December 3rd. A few Members of this House—unhappy victims—sat here until after midnight to enable the Bill to be brought up. The Bill was introduced and read a first time at about a quarter past 12 o'clock that night. The Second Reading was taken on the following day. There were two days debate, on December 4th and 5th, and the Second Reading was then passed.

I confess that that is not a rate of proceeding which I should be inclined to propose to this House. I think it was very rapid. It gave very little time to this House in which to consider a very important measure. But if it should be the pleasure of the House that we should follow that precedent, if it should be the pleasure of the House that the Bill should come up here at midnight on July 30th and then be read a first time, and that the Second Reading debate should be commenced on Tuesday, July 31st, I shall not offer any opposition. But I should not think of proposing such a course. If, however, it would meet the wishes of noble Lords that that course should be taken, and if my noble friend opposite, on consideration, thinks that that course would be most convenient to the House, I certainly shall offer no opposition. I desire that the Bill on Second Reading should be fully discussed. My colleagues and I are perfectly ready to sit here until the Bill has been—that is, if your Lordships are pleased to read it a second time—until the Bill has been read a second time; but we are all mortal, and share the feelings of noble Lords opposite. If we are going to have an autumn session in October we do not wish to stay here any longer in August than is necessary; but, whatever time may suit the convenience of the House for a full and adequate discussion of the Bill on Second Reading, that time we are prepared to give.

I now come to the other points. My noble friend has gone through the list of Bills that were mentioned in the Gracious Speech from the Throne. With regard to the preliminary matters, which cannot be spoken of as measures, I will say nothing. But, in respect to the Bills, I am quite ready to answer my noble friend's inquiries. I will take the Workmen's Compensation Bill. That Bill has passed through the Standing Committee. I do not expect that it will be in this House before October. That is a Bill upon a subject which was dealt with in this House last year. The late Government had a Workmen's Compensation Bill, and that Bill was discussed very fully in your Lordships' House, but it was withdrawn by the then Government in the House of Commons. Then, with respect to the Merchant Shipping Bill, I expect that measure will be in this House before the adjournment. I am told that it is likely to be here about August 2nd. Of course, your Lordships will not be asked to touch that Bill before the adjournment. Then with regard to the Marine Insurance Bill. That Bill is making progress and may also be in this House before the adjournment, so as to be quite ready when we meet again in October. The Prevention of Corruption Bill originated in this House, and is under discussion in the House of Commons. The Labourers (Ireland) Bill is not likely to be in this House before October, but that is a Bill in a very peculiar position, because it is blessed alike by the Nationalist Members and by Colonel Saunderson, and, therefore, it is just possible that it may not create a great deal of opposition in this House.

Then we come to the Trade Disputes Bill. There is some chance—I will not go further than that—that that Bill may come up to us before the adjournment, and may be ready for consideration whenever we choose to take it in October. Then there is the Plural Voting Bill, which will not come up to this House before October; and, although my noble friend stated that that was a very contentious Bill, it is, at all events, very short, and not likely to occupy any very great length of time when it does come up. The Colonial Marriages Bill has gone down to the House of Commons, where I have no doubt it will be passed. With regard to the Equalisation of Rates Bill, I am inclined to think that that Bill is not likely to be introduced at present. As to the Unemployed Bill, my noble friend does not really expect me to say anything at this moment. He has rightly mentioned that a statement is about to be made by my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board at an early date; and it would be entirely out of place that I should in any form anticipate the statement which Mr. John Burns will then make. As regards the Crofters Bill, it is intended to introduce it, and, if possible, to pass it during the present session. The County Justices Bill has been passed. That is the present state of affairs. No doubt there will be several important Bills offered to this House for consideration during the two months of the autumn session, from early in October to the middle of December. I hope they will be here in time to receive full consideration. I can give no pledge on that subject, because the uncertainties of Parliamentary discussions are well known to all of us. I quite agree with my noble friend that the Education Bill in Committee will take a very considerable time, but if you read the Bill a second time before the adjournment you can proceed with the Committee stage at once when you meet again, and you can go through the Committee stage, as I hope you will, steadily until you have brought it to a conclusion. It will take some time, but it will not take two months. Therefore, I still venture to think that, important as these measures are, looking at them altogether, looking to their nature, looking to the fact that some of them have been considered beforehand in this House, your Lordships will be enabled to give a reasonable amount of attention to them within the limits of the autumn session. I can say no more. No man can say with certainty what may be the fate of any measure in either House of Parliament as to the matter of time, but I can truly say to my noble friend that my desire that this House should have every opportunity of discussing every Bill which is submitted to it is just the same as it ever has been, and anything I can do to facilitate the arrival of these Bills here in time to be discussed will certainly be done.

VISCOUNT SIDMOUTH: My Lords, I I hope the noble Marquess will excuse my asking another question—namely, whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to support a Bill which is now passing through the House of Commons, and which will give rise to a great deal of discussion in this House—I refer to the Land Tenure Bill. It is a measure which was introduced by a gentleman after being a fortnight in the House, but whose seat is now vacant. Much interest has been shown in that Bill by members of the Government and by the head of the Administration, and I wish to ask whether the Government propose to support the Bill and bring it into this House when the House of Commons have finished with it.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, I do not know whether the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition is satisfied, but to my mind the reply which has been given by the Leader of the House is singularly unsatisfactory. In the first place, it is couched in the old pot-and-kettle vein, if I may be allowed to use so vulgar an expression, into which debates on this particular subject usually descend. The noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition enumerated a long list of measures which still appear on the Order Paper of the House of Commons. As far as I could gather from the statement of the noble Marquess the Leader of the House, only one of these measures is to be dropped—namely, the Equalisation of Rates Bill, and that is balanced by the statement which the noble Marquess let drop that another Bill which had escaped the notice of my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition is coming up—namely, the Marine Insurance Bill.

What, I take it, was really in the mind of the noble Marquess who raised this discussion was this. As everybody knows, the House of Commons will be occupied with the Education Bill until practically the end of this part of the session. Whether we are going to read the Education Bill a second time before we adjourn or not nobody appears at this moment to know; but what is fairly obvious is this, that our discussion of the Education Bill in Committee will occupy the greater part of the autumn session, for, as the noble Marquess pointed out, there will only be thirty-six Parliamentary days available. What is going to happen in the other House meanwhile? Our time during the autumn session will be almost entirely occupied with the Education Bill, and what I feel curious about is this—What other measures out of this long list are going to be forced through by means of the gag, the guillotine, and the other instruments of torture which are available to the Government?

I have always been in favour of autumn sessions myself; yet our position is apparently not going to be very materially improved. The only difference will be in point of temperature. We shall have to discuss these measures, and presumably will be expected to pass them, within what appears to be an extremely limited period of time; and, if it is only a question of time, it does not make very much difference whether that time is taken in August or October, though personally I prefer the latter alternative. But the principle remains precisely the same. The noble Marquess the Leader of the House has before now supported me in those feeble and ineffective protests which I have occasionally made against the way in which business is conducted in this House. The noble Marquess gave us to understand plainly that, if he ever had the management of affairs, the rights and privileges of this House would be more carefully guarded than they appear to have been during recent years.

Now, what is the result? So far as we can see, our position is not going to be improved in the very smallest degree. I confess, after the statements to which I have alluded—the statements which have been so frequently made, not only by the noble Marquess opposite, but by his colleagues who sit beside him—I am greatly surprised to see him adopt this attitude, and the more so in view of the fact that, in consequence of the high respect he has for this House and by his advice, a large number of new Members have recently been added to it. I submit that, if only out of respect for the newly-made Peers, the noble Marquess might make some honest effort to see that our rights are better safeguarded. From that point of view, at all events, the statement elicited from the noble Marquess is of an extremely unsatisfactory nature.

LORD BURGHCLERE: My Lords, it must be confessed that the noble Lord who has just sat down takes an altogether too pessimistic view as to the course of the Education Bill during the autumn. I can hardly conceive that, with the best intentions, we should spend nearly two months in discussing the Committee stage of that Bill and on Third Reading. I also think that my noble friend—I am sure quite unconsciously—misrepresented the statement of my noble friend the Leader of the House when in Opposition. I never remember hearing my noble friend say what he would do when he came into power with regard to the usual proceedings at the end of the session. I have, however, heard the noble Marquess make a speech which closely resembled that made by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, and I have not the slightest doubt that when once more the wheel of fate goes round and we find ourselves sitting on the Benches opposite, we shall hear the noble Marquess the present Leader of the House make a similar speech to that which has been made to-night by the noble Marquess opposite.

But I do not rise to lament over the congested state of business which, unfortunately, obtains in this House at the end of every session. I rise merely to endorse what I have always held to be the most practical suggestion with regard to the alleviation of these difficulties—a suggestion which has the approval, I understand, of the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition. I refer to the suggestion that more Bills should be introduced into your Lordships' House in the first instance. I do not take the same pessimistic view as the noble Marquess the Leader of the House as to the fate of Bills so introduced in the event of a Liberal Government being in power. I believe that many of the Bills would be fully and fairly discussed here, and the criticism of your Lordships upon them before they went to the other House would be of considerable advantage. A saving of time and, I venture to think, an increase of efficiency would be brought about in this way. When these Bills were sent back, as they inevitably would be, at the end of the session with the opinions of the other House upon them, the attentions of your Lordships would be focussed upon the two or three points of difference, and we should be able to give those points full and fair discussion. I venture to think that such a course as this might be taken, if not with regard to a large number of Bills, at any rate with regard to some of the Departmental measures which are at present introduced in the other House. I agree that it is, perhaps, necessary, in the case of Bills of premier importance, that the heads of Departments should themselves introduce and support those measures.

The Department of my noble friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the Admiralty, which is represented by my noble friend Lord Tweedmouth, are not offices from which many Bills proceed; but there is one Department which is happily represented in this House by its head, namely, the Board of Agriculture, and I do think that some of the Bills which appertain to agriculture might well be introduced in the first instance in this House. I have said on many occasions that your Lordships are most qualified to discuss matters relating to agriculture. We have many practical farmers amongst us; we have many landowners; we have no agricultural labourers, it is true, up to the present time; but we have many noble Lords here who have taken great interest in allotments and small holdings, and I do think that Bills from the Board of Agriculture might be introduced for the first time in this House. There is a measure now before the House of Commons which is not of primary importance—the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill—but it is a measure of considerable interest to the agricultural community. That Bill is highly technical and highly difficult, and had it been introduced here, as it might well have been, it would have saved overburdening and overtaxing the House of Commons, and the discussions upon it in your Lordships' House would have undoubtedly assisted in passing this very useful measure into law.

There is another measure before the House of Commons. I know it is a private Member's Bill, but rumour has it that facilities are to be given, and that when it comes up to your Lordships' House it may be supported by the Government. The measure I refer to is the Land Tenure Bill. I think it would have been far better, if His Majesty's Government are going to support that Bill, if it had been introduced on their own authority in the House of Lords. We should then have known what the opinion of His Majesty's Government was on that matter without having to glean it from the Amendments moved in Standing Committee. When that Bill had passed your Lordships' House, as I have not the slightest doubt it would have done, possibly with some slight alteration, it would have been sent to the Commons. We should have had it returned to us, perhaps, at the end of the session, but we would then have been able to concentrate our attention on the points of difference between the two Houses, instead of having to wade through the whole Bill practically at the point of the bayonet. I think that if His Majesty's Government would consider the advisability of introducing Bills for the first time in your Lordships' House it would be of considerable advantage. My noble friend who leads the House knows that I make these suggestions in no hostile spirit. I am sure that he, of all men, is most desirous of maintaining the efficiency of this House, and of seeing that its proceedings are conducted in the manner best calculated to promote the dignity of Parliament.

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: My Lords, my noble friend opposite has raised an interesting point, but, while admitting that it is a very important one for future discussion, I think it rather undesirable that we should be led away at this moment from the point which is really occupying our attention—namely, the situation into which we have drifted, or apparently are going to drift during the autumn session. Though I would not wish to put an unfavourable construction upon what fell from my noble friend the Leader of the House, I cannot say that his statement was at all reassuring. He made one observation which was very important—namely, that he is an enemy of the guillotine, though he believes it has come to stay with us. I venture to lay it down as a general proposition, that the more the guillotine is exercised the more should the functions of this House be preserved. In cases of extreme complication and extreme importance, the more the House of Commons through the difficulties of its constitution is denied the power of criticism, the more ought all parties to combine to maintain for this House in undiminished strength that power which it is our duty to exercise—namely, the power of revision as well as of legislation generally.

I do not think it will be denied that there are some functions which we ought to exercise, and I am sure the majority of your Lordships desire to know to what extent in the coming autumn session we shall be able to exercise the power of revision over Bills, upon which it is clear the guillotine must fall in the other House, if they are to be passed at all. In that respect, I think we are in an exceptional position. I do not remember that there has been so large a group of Bills striking at fundamental principles reserved to come up within the short compass of a few weeks for discussion. It is from that point of view that I trust His Majesty's Government will reconsider the position, and that at all events we may be preserved from that undignified position—a position which this House would be bound to resent—of having the pistol put at our heads in the last days of December, and being called upon to pass Bills which have been guillotined in part in the House of Commons and which we have not had time to review.

It would be most unfair to this House, it would be dangerous to our reputation as a legislative assembly, if the group of Bills which the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition has placed before us should not be properly discussed. Whether they can be properly discussed I do not know. I doubt whether my noble friend the Leader of the House knows himself whether it is possible for them to be discussed. Might I, at all events, make this appeal to him, that in the conduct of the business of the House of Commons the Government will consider what is to be the course of business in this House. There are two methods in which the business might be conducted. Frequently it happens that a number of Bills are taken at the same time, so that you have them almost in the same stage in this House. If that should be the course of business in the autumn session, then there will be an undesirable rush of business in the last days of the session.

I would press on my noble friend that he should exercise his influence so that when the Government begin to deal with these Bills they will deal with one first, pass it, and let us have it early in the autumn session, so that we can take it as soon as convenient after the Education Bill. Does my noble friend think it would be possible seriously to consider this matter with his colleagues for the avowed purpose of securing the privileges and the performance of the duties of this House? Will he consider whether, in the conduct of business, this question cannot be before the minds of the Cabinet—Can we manage to get this Bill into the House of Lords at a time when it will be possible for their Lordships to perform their duty in regard to it?

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I do not know whether the noble Marquess who leads this House is going to make any reply to the Question addressed to him just now by Lord Newton. I will venture to repeat that Question, and I hope I may be more successful in eliciting an answer from the Government Bench. The noble Marquess after going through the list of Bills which were mentioned by my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition, said there were other Bills that might be brought before the House. I venture to hope that if there are any such Bills, the noble Marquess will tell us their names. I do not know anything about fertilisers and feeding stuffs, but it seems to me that your Lordships have been promised an ample supply of feeding stuff to last you from October till the middle or the end of December; and if there are any other Bills to be introduced, I venture to think His Majesty's Government ought in fairness to tell the House the names of those Bills.

Consider what is going to happen in October. This House is to engage in the discussion of the Education Bill in Committee. Well, my Lords, what is going to take place during all this time in the other House? Is the House of Commons going to take up a number of other important Bills, to pass those Bills, and then send them up to this House to add to the number of important measures which we are to be called upon to pass? This is a most important question. The Land Tenure Bill has been alluded to on both sides of the House. I should like to ask what sort of Bill that is. There are a great many Bills of that kind, and it is impossible to say whether they are private Members' Bills or Government Bills, or what they are. With regard to some of these Bills we see this course adopted. One of His Majesty's Ministers receives deputations, takes up the Bill, and in speaking upon it assures the House that the Government approves of the Bill. The result is that we do not know whether the Bill is really a Government Bill or a private Member's Bill. In a somewhat lengthy experience of Parliament I never remember until this Session seeing that course taken by Members of His Majesty's Government. I hope that if there are any other Bills to be brought before this House beyond those which he has mentioned, the noble Marquess will be able to give us their names.

LORD HENEAGE: My Lords, I should like to ask for more information from the noble Marquess the Leader of your Lordships' House. So far as private Members of this House are concerned, we have received no more information than we could have obtained by looking at the Order Book in the Lobby of the other House. We are not told precisely when the Second Reading of the Education Bill is to take place. We do not know whether we shall be able to get away at the end of the first week in August, or whether we are to be kept tlll the end of the second week. The only information we have received is that three Bills will be brought up to this House before the adjournment—the Education Bill, the Workmen's Compensation Bill, and the Merchant Shipping Bill. Then, with regard to the meeting of the House in

October, we are not told anything like the approximate date on which we shall meet. We are informed that the House will meet early in October. Some of us hope that it will not be so very early in October. If we are to remain here till about August 6th or 7th, I cannot think that we shall be desirous of coming back again by October 6th or 7th. Therefore, I think it is only fair that we should have some idea as to the date that will be fixed for the re-assembling of Parliament.

There are many Members of your Lordships' House who take a very active part in duties in their respective counties, and I think we ought to have some idea as to when we can safely make arrangements for meetings. I hope we shall receive some information on that point, and also on the point that has been raised by my noble friends Lord Camperdown and Lord Newton. It is clear from what we have been told that the three principal measures of the session will not be before the House of Commons in the autumn, and, therefore, there is the possibility that they will be passing further legislation. We are certainly not going to deal with private Members' Bills and ill-considered measures brought in to redeem idle pledges given at election time, and passed simply because the House of Commons wants work to do while we are considering the Education Bill.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I think His Majesty's Government must have appreciated the fact that your Lordships are not entirely satisfied with the very courteous, but not very informative, speech which the noble Marquess the Leader of the House has addressed to us. I do not think that the noble Marquess showed in his remarks any appreciation of the fact that the present state of things is entirely unprecedented. There was one noble Lord (Lord Burghclere) who supported the Government, and he said in his breezy way, "This is always the sort of language which the Leader of the Opposition uses as to the treatment of your Lordships' House." The fact is that the present state of things has never occurred before in the whole history of Parliament.

Do the Government realise that, so far as your Lordships' House is concerned, the whole business of the session is thrown over till the autumn? That is a state of things which I do not believe has ever occurred before. When there have been autumn sessions on previous occasions it has been usual for the Government to explain that the state of things was very unusual, and that they asked for unexampled powers in respect of very special measures. Previous Governments have recognised fully that it was asking a great deal to ask Parliament to re-assemble in the autumn, and a programme has been submitted. As the noble Marquess knows, when we were responsible for affairs in 1902, the autumn session was called specially and entirely to discuss one particular measure of great importance. That was all that was done. Compare that with the present state of things. Compare that with the long list of measures which my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition has read out.

How many of these Bills are the Government going to proceed with? That is a question which I should like the noble Marquess or one of his colleagues to answer. Are they going to proceed with the whole of the list? The Government know as well as I do that that is a perfectly ludicrous proposal. If they are going to ask Parliament to re-assemble in the autumn the least they can do is to tell us what measures they intend to proceed with. What did Mr. Gladstone do when he had autumn sessions? Did he enter into an autumn session with a light heart and with a long list of thirteen or fourteen Bills? Not at all. When he asked for power to adjourn until the autumn he explained to the House of Commons that the Bills he intended to proceed with were Bills of especial urgency and were very necessary. I looked up just now what Mr. Gladstone said on one occasion. He said—

> "We have considered many urgent claims upon the time of the House, and what we feel is that our only choice is to select the best and most urgent claims among many which are both urgent and good."

Therefore, Mr. Gladstone recognised that it was only one, or perhaps two, of the important measures of the session which should be dealt with in the autumn. Speaking later, he said—

> "The case is wholly presented to the House as a case of urgency, and a case, generally speaking, of necessity."

That was the spirit in which the great Parliamentary Leaders of the past asked Parliament to vary its usual procedure and sit in the autumn; but the present Government seem to have had entered into this autumn session with the idea that it was very ordinary, and that there was nothing simpler than to pass thirteen or fourteen measures between the middle of October and the middle of December. It is obvious that that cannot be done.

In the same speech which I have quoted, Mr. Gladstone said—

> "It is a matter which hardly admits of absolutely mathematical precision, but in these cases it usually happens that the expectations as to time are more apt to be exceeded than to allow of any economy."

That observation was applied to two Bills—the Parish Councils Bill and the Employers' Liability Bill, which were the two measures Mr. Gladstone selected. He was perfectly right. Parliament did not sit only, as he expected, until Christmas, but right on into the New Year. I want to know from the Government whether they intend to sit on into the New Year. It really is for the convenience of your Lordships' House to know exactly what is before you. Are the Government going to give up not only that part of the autumn which is so important for the departmental work, and to which my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition referred, but also the whole of the winter months to discussions in Parliament? If so, the probability is that the programme which they will lay before Parliament in the next normal session will be of the most jejune and unsatisfactory character, and in the meantime the great departmental offices will suffer very much from the pressure which will be thrown on the Ministers to discharge their Parliamentary duties. When the House of Lords is asked to take this exceptional course, we are entitled to a full statement as to exactly what is before us. Supposing it to be the fact, as I cannot help thinking it is, that the noble Marquess opposite has not consulted his colleagues in the Cabinet as to the reply he should give, I would suggest that we might be allowed to raise this question again, and that he should in the meantime consult his colleagues so as to be able to to give us a reply at length on another day. I contend that we are entitled to a reply. I am confident that the only result of this drifting on from one day to another, and from one month to another, will be that a great many of the Bills which are put forward as serious Bills will have to be dropped, and there will be great disappointment both here and in another place with regard to those measures. I earnestly hope that we may have a fuller reply from His Majesty's Government.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, I can assure the noble Viscount opposite (Lord Goschen) that it is very far from our desire in any way to curtail the discussion of any measures which may come before your Lordships' House. I can also assure him that, in consultation with our colleagues elsewhere, we shall use every effort to see that the course of business may be so arranged as to bring about the full discussion in this House of all measures which come up from another place. The noble Marquess who has just sat down struck a somewhat different note from that which was struck by the Leader of the Opposition in the Question which he asked. The noble Marquess who has just sat down appears to regard it as a matter of some complaint that we are going to have an autumn session at all.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I did not say that.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Well, the noble Marquess produced quotations and made observations of his own to the effect that an autumn session ought to be reserved, so to speak, for State occasions, and he appeared to think that this was not a year in which an autumn session might reasonably be held.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: No.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Of course if the noble Marquess contradicts me, I withdraw that statement.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I never said it was a year in which an autumn session ought not to be held. I said that if we are going to have an autumn session we are at least entitled, this being an exceptional proceeding, to know exactly what is in store for us.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: The noble Marquess the Leader of the House gave an exceedingly clear account of what the order of business would be during the autumn session. I think I might, however, before saying a word upon that, be allowed to point out that when the noble Marquess who has just sat down speaks of our proceedings as unprecedented, he forgets that the circumstances under which we met were, if not unprecedented, at any rate very unusual. What happened? The late Prime Minister, Mr. Balfour, resigned on December 4th of last year, and the present Prime Minister's Government was approved on December 10th. The general election began on January 8th and terminated, speaking generally, on January 31st. It is perfectly obvious that during the whole of that time it was impossible for members of the Government, who had to fight for their seats, to go into the consideration of important measures, which, under ordinary circumstances, would have been thought out and considered in the previous autumn. Parliament was not able to meet until February 13th, and consequently there is no doubt—I frankly admit it—that the whole of the Parliamentary session has been pushed back to some extent; and it became obvious, therefore, that an autumn session was absolutely necessary.

The noble Lord opposite, Lord Newton, seemed to consider that it was unlikely that we should be able in the autumn session in this House to deal with much beside the Committee stage of the Education Bill. I have sat for a good many years in this House, and if this measure is going to take in Committee, I will not say thirty days, but a very much smaller number of days than that, it will be utterly unlike any measure which I have ever seen. The Education Act of 1902 was considered in this House for three days in Committee, and a considerable portion of the first of those days were taken up by several speeches which ought to have been made on the Second Reading, but were allowed to be made on the Motion to go into Committee. So far as points in dispute are concerned, there were quite as many points in dispute in the Act of 1902 as there are in the measure which will come up to your Lordships' House at the end of this month. I am very far from suggesting that your Lordships should confine the consideration of that measure to three days; but there is a considerable difference between three days and thirty-six days, and I hope it may be found possible to strike some mean which will give time for the consideration of other measures.

Then the noble Lord seemed to think that while we were discussing this measure in Committee the House of Commons would sit either kicking its heels doing nothing, or devising dangerous measures of some kind which would be brought up to your Lordships' House at a later stage. I venture to think that if noble Lords had followed closely the statement of my noble friend the Leader of the House they would have seen, from the account he gave of the stage which important Government Bills have now reached, that there are two or three of those measures the later stages of which would, in the ordinary course, be taken in the House of Commons while we are discussing the Education Bill in Committee here. I do not dispute that the work in this House during the autumn session will be arduous and continuous. I am sure none of your Lordships would wish to make a complaint of that fact. But so far as we are able to judge, the order in which the measures will come up from another place will be such as to leave very few gaps, and at the same time, we hope, to give the ordinary adequate degree of discussion which measures of that importance are accustomed to receive in your Lordships' House.

I may say, in reply to Lord Camperdown, that so far as I am aware, there are no measures of what could be called importance, no measures of the character of those mentioned in the King's Speech, which are likely to come up for consideration beside those already known to your Lordships. I cannot say offhand what Departmental measures may appear; but, so far as what are called important measures are concerned, I can venture to reassure the noble Earl on that point. As regards the Land Tenure Bill in another place, I am instructed that in its amended form His Majesty's Government view it with general approval, and would be glad to see it passed; but, further than that, I am not in a position to give the information for which the noble Earl asks. I think I have covered most of the ground raised by the noble Marquess, but if there is any point I have omitted I have no doubt noble Lords will raise it.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Can the noble Marquess tell us on what date in October he desires that we should reassemble?

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I cannot give the exact date, but if my noble friend will ask me the question another time, I will give him the earliest information in my power.

House adjourned at half-past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 5*th July*, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

London and North Western Railway Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [Lords]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [Lords]; Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords]; Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [Lords]. Reported with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Dover Corporation Bill [Lords]. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time.

Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 7).

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS reported from the Committee on Group 7 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; from Barnet (two); Grosmont; Leiston cum Sizewell; Monken Hadley; and, Ugley; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petition from Wakefield, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petitions against alteration of Law; from Brinsley; Caddington; Hucknall under Huthwaite; Sutton in Ashfield; and South Croydon; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow (two), in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION, ETC. (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Eaglesham, against; to lie upon the Table.

POISIONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petitions for alteration; from Blaydon on Tyne; Chester le Street; Dover; and, Everton; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PURCHASE INSPECTORS (IRELAND).

Return [presented 3rd July] to be printed. [No. 237.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Copy presented, of Note explaining the Repeal Schedule [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LAND REGISTRY.

Account presented of receipts and payments in respect of the Land Registry for the year ended March 31st, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 238.]

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE AND COURT OF APPEAL, ETC.

Copy presented of Account showing the Receipts and Expenditure in respect of the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal during the year ended March 31st, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 239.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill, Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill, Metropolitan District Railway Bill, without Amendment.

Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill, Waterford Corporation and Bridge Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to—Hull and Barnsley and Great Central Railway Companies Bill [Lords], Trent Navigation Company Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Worcester Election. That they acquaint this House that His Majesty has appointed To-morrow, at Three of the clock, to receive the Address of both Houses of Parliament on the Election for the city of Worcester, and that they have appointed the Lord Steward and the Gentleman-at-Arms to present the said Address on the part of their Lordships; and that they do desire this House to appoint a proportionate number of its members to present the said Address with their Lordships.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY BILL.

Lords Amendment to be considered To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 297.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Local Authorities and Teachers' Salaries.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Board of Education authorises the practice that teachers in schools cannot receive payment of salary until copies of agreement forms have been completed by them with the county education authorities; and, if so, whether, in view of the effect of this rule, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have no information that any such practice exists. The Board of Education do not intervene as to the arrangements made by local education authorities for the payment of teachers' salaries. The only point in which that Board are concerned in this connection is to secure that every teacher is employed under a written agreement, or, in the case of council schools, under a minute of the local authority. It would not be desirable to waive this requirement, and I think that no difficulties need arise out of it in practice which cannot be satisfactorily met.

Money Orders—System of Payment.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that when a person sends any small sum of money from Great Britain to Germany through the Post Office the money is taken to the residence of the person to whom it is addressed, but in the case of money sent from Germany or elsewhere to this country the receiver of the money order has to go to the post office for the money; whether he will introduce the German system into this country, in view of the convenience that would result in case of telegraph money orders if the money was taken to the residence of the addressee, as is the practice in every foreign country, and of the saving of time and protection that would be afforded if the money with the 10,000,000 money orders annually issued in this country were brought to the people's residences rather than 10,000,000 persons should have to go to the post offices for the money, and of the saving of time involved in one person delivering the money with 200 money orders than that of 200 persons going to the post office in a town for the money.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The system of money orders payable at the residences of the addressees, which the hon. Member describes as the German system, has some advantages and many drawbacks. It has frequently been considered and rejected as less advantageous on the whole in this country than the present system. But I cannot accept my hon. friend's assumptions nor his figures. For instance, half of the ten millions of money orders which he mentions are paid through banks, so that it is not the case that ten million persons have to go to the post office to cash ten million orders.

Post Office Savings Bank.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the Post Office Savings Bank refuses to take sixpences on deposit; will he explain why a depositor is allowed to withdraw 19s. 6d., but is not allowed to deposit 12s. 6d. in the savings bank; and whether he will give instructions to abolish this anomaly.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The refusal of the Post Office Savings Bank to take fractions of a shilling on deposit is based on the provisions of the Post Office Savings Bank Act of 1861, and no change could therefore be made without legislation.

Lighting and Ventilating Department—Pension System.

MR. WALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether retired employees of the Lighting and Ventilating Department are receiving pensions under a scheme which was formerly in existence: and, if so, would he consider the advisability of restoring this system of pensions in consideration of long service and good conduct, taking into account the fact that some members of the present staff have been connected with this Government Department for over twenty years, while in one case a workman has been employed for forty-five years.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Pensions were granted to persons appointed before the passing of the Superannuation Act of 1859. Those appointed after that date are employed on a non-pensionable footing, without certificates from the Civil Service Commissioners. They are excluded from pension by the terms of Section 17 of the Superannuation Act of 1859, but gratuities may be granted to them under Section 4 of the Superannuation Act of 1887.

Vizamgam-Malia Line.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for India, having regard to the fact that the reconnaissance of two alternative routes for the construction of the Vizamgam-Malia line has been sanctioned, will he state when the reconnaissances are likely to be completed; and whether either route passes through the territory of the Rao of Cutch.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I regret that I am unable at present to state when the reconnaissance sanctioned in January last will be completed. One of the routes to be reconnoitred passes through the territories of the Rao of Cutch.

Minutes of Intermediate Board.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when he intends laying upon the Table the minutes of the various meetings of the Intermediate Board, held to discuss the proposals in the Resolution of the House of Commons of May 21st regarding their rules for 1907,† as well as all the correspondence which passed between the Irish Government and the Board on this subject.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Intermediate Board have been informed of the wish expressed in the House that the minutes mentioned in the Question should be presented to the House, and have been told that the Irish Government are willing that the minutes should be presented, and that, in order to enable them to do so, a copy should be supplied by the board. The reply of the board to this letter and the copy desired are now awaited. As respects the correspondence, the reply of the board to a letter sent to them by the Irish Government last Monday is now expected, and when it has been received I shall be in a better position to state the date at which the correspondence can be presented.

Russian Government—Shipping Claims.

Mr HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in a position to report any further progress in the negotiations with the Russian Government with reference to the claim of the crew, the owners of the ships and cargo, which were sunk, and for which no compensation has been made; and whether he is aware that the crew have abandoned all hope of their claim being settled by diplomatic negotiations, and are now taking legal proceedings to enforce a claim against the owners of the respective vessels.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Answer given by me on the 17th of May last respecting the British shipping claims.‡ Since that date, the Russian Government have refused to entertain a claim put forward on behalf of the crew of the "Allanton," on the ground that the Supreme Court decided that the seizure and detention of that vessel was regular and that they were unaware of any grounds either in Russian or International Law on which such claims could be maintained. His Majesty's Government are still in communication with the Russian Government in regard to the cases of the "Knight Commander," "Malacca," and "Calchas." I am not in possession of any precise information as to the position of the legal proceedings referred to in the Question.

Light Railways Act, 1896—Advances.

Mr. THORNTON (Clapham): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what is the aggregate of the sums advanced by the Treasury up to the present time under Section 4 of the Light Railways Act, 1896, and of special advances under Section 5 of that Act; whether there are any outstanding payments still to be made under either section; and whether it is the intention of the Government to institute any inquiry into the working of the Act by means of a departmental or other committee.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Under Section 4 of the Light Railways Act, 1896, £13,500 has been advanced up to the present time, and further loans amounting to £35,000 have been conditionally agreed to. Under Section 5, special advances have been conditionally agreed to amounting to £212,495, of which £139,128 has been actually advanced, leaving £73,367 outstanding. My right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade informs me that he sees no reason for the appointment of a Committee as suggested.

District Railway.

Mr. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that the District Railway have for many hours of the day reduced the number of carriages making up a train to four, and in many cases three, and that as a result much overcrowding and inconvenience is occasioned to travellers, not unattended with danger; and whether he will consider the advisability of making representations to the company on the subject, and, if necessary, framing regulations which shall prevent a continuance of the practice complained of.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clvii., 1072.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 643.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) Complaint has been made to the Board of Trade that the Metropolitan District Railway Company have reduced the number of carriages making up certain of their trains, and I have been in communication with the railway company on the subject. The company now inform me that the frequent services of seven-car trains, which were at first provided after the introduction of electric traction upon their line in 1905, were found to be in excess of public requirements, and have consequently been curtailed from time to time. The company add that they still have these services under careful observation, and are of opinion that the trains at present run meet the requirements of their passengers. If the hon. Member will furnish specific instances of habitual over-crowding of these shortened trains, further inquiry shall be made, but the Board of Trade have no powers which would enable them to frame regulations of the nature suggested.

Education Bill—Position of Schools.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether schools recognised under Clause 38, Part 5, of the Education Bill, 1906, as elementary schools being part of or held in the premises of an institution in which children are boarded, will be considered as exempt from the provisions of Parts 1 and 2 of the Bill; and will such schools with the sanction of the local education authority, receiving aid from the Parliamentary grant but not from the rates, be allowed to control their own management, including the appointment of teachers and all questions of finance, as they do now under Clause 15 of the Education Act, 1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have nothing to add to the Answer I gave yesterday to the hon. Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool in regard to these points, and I must decline to forestall by Question and Answer discussion upon points that may be raised in Committee in respect of later clauses of the Bill.

Education Bill—Position of Teachers.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Board of Education will, under Article 15 of the Code, decline to recognise a teacher who enters into an agreement with a local authority to give religious instruction as part of the staff of a school or of a department of a school.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether a requirement to give religious instruction is a duty connected with the work of a public elementary school within the meaning of Article 15 of the Code.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether a requirement to give religious instruction embodied in an agreement between a teacher and a local education authority will fall under Article 15 of the Code.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I must remind the hon. Baronet that articles in the Code may be modified if it should seem expedient or necessary, in view of any particular provisions in the Law which differ from those which the present Code may have designed to meet. Hence I cannot, at this stage, undertake to say in what way any article in the present Code will operate under any new conditions that may be brought about by the new Bill.

Parliamentary Registration (Ireland) Act, 1855.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of any correspondence that has taken place between the superintendent registrar of deaths in the Naas union district and the Under-Secretary for Ireland and the Registrar-General for Ireland, on the subject of the furnishing of Annual Returns of the deaths of adults with reference to the carrying into effect of the provisions of Section 16 of the Parliamentary Registration (Ireland) Act of 1855, and if he will state how under the circumstances stated in the superintendent registrar's letter of the 15th instant, addressed to the Under-Secretary for Ireland, superintendent registrars are to comply with the law; and whether the Government would consider the propriety of making provision for the payment of remuneration to superintendent registrars for preparing the Returns, and allowing for any out-of-pocket expenses incurred in attending at the several registration stations for this purpose, there being no obligation on them to attend at any other place than their offices.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Government are aware of the official correspondence referred to. It is established that a local registrar is not bound to attend at the office of the superintendent registrar to enable the latter to extract from the registers the information required to carry into effect the enactment quoted. It is also the fact that there is no section of the Births and Deaths Registration Acts, nor any regulations made by the Registrar-General, obliging the superintendent registrar to attend at any place other than his office. It is evident, however, that the superintendent registrar, though he may not be specifically directed to do so, must, in order to comply with the Registration (Ireland) Rules, attend at the registrar's offices to get the necessary information to enable him to prepare the Death Returns. Upon the subject of remuneration, I beg to refer to my reply to the Question of the hon. Member for South Down on June 21st. There is no power to authorise the payment of remuneration.

Irish Railways Inquiry.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the gentlemen who are to serve on the committee of inquiry respecting Irish railways have been already nominated; and whether Parliament will be afforded an opportunity of selecting or approving of this committee.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the proposed terms of reference to guide the committee in the inquiry on Irish railways will be submitted to the House previous to its adoption.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Government are considering the names of gentlemen to be asked to hold this inquiry, and the terms of reference are also under consideration. An announcement on both points will be made in due course, but I do not know of any precedent for inviting a discussion in this House upon either the names or the terms of reference.

Congested Districts Board and Baslickane Farm, County Kerry.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, can he state what the Congested Districts Board intend to do with the untenanted land of Baslickane farm, on the Butler estate, at Waterville, county Kerry; is the Board aware of the loss sustained by the caretakers in the farm since its purchase by the Board, and, if not, will they inquire into these cases with a view to remedying this loss; and will the Board consider the applications for allotments at an early date.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Congested Districts Board intend to utilise the Baslickane farm for the migration of a few tenants from the Burns-Hartopp estate, which adjoins the Butler estate, and for the enlargement of adjacent small holdings on both estates. The Board are not aware that the caretakers have sustained any loss since the Board arranged to purchase the Butler estate, which is not yet vested in them. The Board do not intend to give any of the land to any person except landholders on the Butler and Burns-Hartopp estates, and they are not prepared to consider applications for allotments from any other persons.

Intermediate Board and House of Commons.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what proceedings he intends to take in order to compel the Intermediate Board of Education in Ireland to obey the resolution unanimously passed by the House of Commons; and whether he intends to allow a nominated board which defies Parliament to remain in its present unconstitutional non-elected irresponsible position.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I cannot at present state what action the Irish Government will take in this matter, but I do not understand from the letter recently received from the Board that they now entertain the intention attributed to them in the Question. The reply from the Intermediate Board to a letter addressed to them some days ago is at present awaited by the Irish Government.

Foyle and Bann Fisheries.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if he is aware of the action of the conservators of the Foyle and Bann fisheries, in attempting to deprive the deep sea fishermen of their rights in the pursuit of their calling by endeavouring to prohibit the ordinary use of drift nets in the open sea and imposing various other restrictions; and whether he will take any steps in the matter to protect the fishermen from such treatment.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The question of the use of drift nets for the capture of almon off the coasts of the Ballyshannon, Letterkenny, Londonderry, and Coleraine fishery districts formed the subject of inquiries recently held by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction at eight different places in the locality. A decision in the matter has not yet been arrived at.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

9th Queen's Royal Lancers.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the 9th Queen's Royal Lancers are under orders to proceed from India to South Africa in the Autumn; that this regiment has already served for three years in South Africa; and whether, seeing that there is at the present time in India at least one cavalry regiment which has never been stationed in South Africa, he will say whether there is any precedent for a regiment being sent to that country both at the commencement and again at the conclusion of its tour of foreign service.

SIR CARNE RASH (Essex, Chelmsford): Is it not the fact that the foreign service of a regiment is quite irrespective of the place it happens to be quartered?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): We endeavour as far as possible to make it fall conveniently. The raising of the cavalry garrison in South Africa in 1904 from two regiments to four necessitated the formation of a new roster. The 9th Lancers are going from India to South Africa in the ordinary course, as they are at the top of that roster. One cavalry regiment will, under the present arrangement, go every year from India to South Africa, so that every regiment now in India will go in time to South Africa. There is no precedent for the exceptional position in which the 9th Lancers are placed in consequence of circumstances not likely to again occur. They were stationed in South Africa in 1896 on account of the increase of the garrison in that country.

SIR W. EVANS-GORDON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could say how long the 9th Lancers would be in South Africa this time.

MR. HALDANE: I should not like to pledge myself to an Answer now. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will put down a Question.

Cairo Barracks.

SIR CARNE RASCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the cavalry regiment recently ordered out to Cairo found on its arrival there that the cavalry barracks were in the possession of an infantry regiment, thus necessitating the occupation of the vacant infantry barracks by the cavalry regiment and the separation of the officers and men from their horses, to the discomfort and inconvenience of the regiment; and whether he will take such steps as will ensure that the cavalry regiment in question shall have the use of its own quarters at as early a date as possible.

MR. HALDANE: The General Officer Commanding is responsible for the distribution of the troops in the various barracks in his command. Inquiries on the point will be made.

Chinese Coolies in South Africa—The Repatriation Proclamation.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state whether His Majesty's Government propose to set any, and, if so, what limitation of time or number on the further importation of Chinese coolies into the Transvaal.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): I beg also to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a time limit will at once be fixed beyond which no more Chinese coolies should be imported into South Africa, whether under contracts already entered into or otherwise; and, if so, whether the Government will immediately telegraph to Lord Selborne the date so fixed, with orders to notify it to every one concerned.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): My hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Abercromby division has given me private notice of a Question on the subject of the issue of a new proclamation, and it will, I think, be convenient if I answer the Question of my hon. friend and other Questions on the same subject at the same time. In order to remove all possible doubt or suspicion as to the intentions of His Majesty's Government from the minds of the Chinese coolies and others, the Secretary of State has given instructions for the issue and posting of an amended proclamation which I will shortly lay upon the Table of the House. All minatory and hortatory sentences contained in the original proclamation will be omitted. And for the following words:—"If circumstances appear to me to warrant it, I will take note of and register the application, but the applicant will thereafter have to make an honest effort by working on his mine to earn a contribution towards his expenses. Of such honest efforts I will constitute myself the judge and should any fail in this respect his application will be cancelled. On receipt of the applications from the various mines I will carefully weigh each individual case and decide which of them are deserving of the generous consideration of the Government and entitled to this favoured treatment" will be substituted the following:—"I will take note of and register the application. It will then be your duty if required to work on your mine faithfully and honestly for one month. If at the end of this period you are still of the same mind and will contribute half of the wages earned in that month towards your travelling expenses, I will arrange for your return to China without unnecessary delay." Further, upon the question of a time limit, in view of the evident public advantage to be gained by the certain and total arrest of all importations of coolies under outstanding licences before the establishment of a Transvaal representative Assembly the Secretary of State will now name the 30th day of November as a date after which His Majesty's Consular representatives in China may be instructed to resume the functions now delegated by them to the representatives of the Labour Importation Agency in respect of recruiting, and to discontinue the issue of all licences to recruit.

Indentured Chinese in the Transvaal.

SIR CARNE RASCH: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the approximate number of indentured Chinese in the Transvaal when the Government took office; what are the numbers now; and how many have been repatriated.

MR. CHURCHILL: The numbers on December 20th, 1905, were 47,241; and before the appointment of His Majesty's present advisers, licences to import a further 14,700 had already been issued and were outstanding. Of these licences about 7,000 have been worked off up to the present time. The coolie population would therefore have been increased about 54,000 as the result of the policy of the late Government. But Lord Selborne has repatriated under various clauses of the Ordinance above 2,000 coolies; and the total number of Chinese upon the Rand on May 31st, which is our latest figure, was 50,974.

SIR CARNE RASCH: How many have been repatriated?

MR. CHURCHILL: I have said about 2,000.

SIR CARNE RASCH: Do these include the sick and dead?

MR. CHURCHILL: They include those who had been repatriated through sickness or misconduct, but certainly not deceased coolies sent back in accordance with the custom of their country.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) asked how many coolies out of the 2,000 had been repatriated under the most recent proclamation.

MR. CHURCHILL: As far as I am aware, up to date fifty-four have applied. [OPPOSITION cries of "Applied?"]—Yes, they have gone.

Coolie Desertions.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the number of Chinese coolies who deserted from the gold mines in the Transvaal during the months of March, April, and May respectively.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have only the returns for March and April; that for May has not yet arrived. The total number of convictions for the three offences—absence without permit, desertion, and unlawful absence—were in March 1,169, and in April 821.

African Forests.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government has under consideration the propriety of restricting the wholesale felling of forests in order to facilitate the shifting and temporary cultivation practised by the natives in British Central Africa, whereby, in part, at any rate, the drying up of Lake Nyassa and the Shiré River have resulted to the detriment of trade, cultivation, and navigation, and whether he will arrange that privileges accorded to the original inhabitants in respect of clearing forest land shall not be given to immigrants from neighbouring Portuguese territory.

MR. CHURCHILL: The question of forest conservation in British Central Africa is engaging the attention of the local authorities and the Secretary of State with a view of preserving the forests from improvident treatment by settlers of whatever nationality.

The Disturbances in Natal.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state how many natives have been killed since the beginning of the military operations now being carried on against them by the Natal authorities; what proportion the wounded bear to the killed; and how many of the white forces in the field have been killed and wounded during the same period.

MR. CHURCHILL: From the information in the Colonial Office, it would appear that twelve white men have been killed and thirty wounded since the beginning of May. No trustworthy accounts of native losses are available, and I would recommend the House to receive, with considerable reserve, statements of native casualties, admittedly based upon "estimates" which are almost invariably much exaggerated by the victors in any action. I cannot therefore attempt to state the proportion between native and British losses; but of course the number of the native killed and wounded greatly exceeds that of the white troops, who are armed with modern weapons and compelled to fire at close quarters with these weapons upon charging masses of spearmen. The native wounded are taken from the field to the neighbouring kraals, with which the country is thickly studded, and are there tended by their own people. I do not know what is the proportion of wounded to killed; but it would certainly not be less than half-and-half.

MR. W. REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked whether the hon. Gentleman's attention had been called to the description of some of these engagements as a drive, and what did that mean. Were these natives hunted down like the beasts of the field?

MR. KEIR HARDIE asked whether there was any truth in the report that native levies who accompanied the Natal troops despatched the wounded after the engagement.

MR. CHURCHILL said he certainly did not think there was any truth in an implication of the nature conveyed in the last Question. As to the significance of the word "drive," he should have thought it was an operation that had been made tolerably familiar, unfortunately, in recent years.

Mr. W. REDMOND said he had only heard the word in connection with grouse.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) In fact it is merely a technical expression.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can give the House particulars of the fighting in Natal, near Noodsberg, on Sunday last; the extent of the carnage; and especially the respective casualties of the white and black contending forces.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The following telegram has been received from the Governor:—"2nd July, No. 7. Barker's Transvaal Mounted Rifles, moving from Dalton to Isidembeni Mission to take part in to-morrow's operations were attacked by Mhlubi and Xakwana's tribes, 1,500 strong, who advanced to close quarters. Rebels repulsed and pursued down Insuzi Valley. Their loss estimated at 600. Our loss trooper Knight killed, troopers Simcox and Tobin wounded."

Mr. BYLES said there had been very severe fighting since Sunday, and asked whether the hon. Gentleman had any information as to that. It was reported that the rebels fought half-heartedly, and retired eventually before terrific rifle and Maxim firing. Was that what Englishmen considered fair fighting?

Mr. CHURCHILL said he had received another telegram to the following effect:—"Governor Sir H. E. McCallum to the Earl of Elgin. (Received Colonial Office, 11 p.m., July 4, 1906.) July 4, No. 2.—Major Campbell, Durban Light Infantry, escorting convoy 22 wagons Bond's Drift to Thring's Post with detachments of Durban Light Infantry, Northern District Mounted Rifles, Zululand Mounted Rifles, 140 strong in all, attacked in the evening of July 1st Macrae's Store by impi 500 strong Gobizembi's and Nhlovus tribes; rebels charged three times but repulsed with steady fire. Laager formed escort, stood to arms all night. On following morning 40 rebels found dead; two wounded, who were attended to and left on field when convoy again set out for Thring's Post, which was reached July 3rd. Trooper Coll, Zululand Mounted Rifles, severely wounded by assegais, since dead. All ranks behaved greatest steadiness."

The Ceylon Pearl Fisheries.

Mr. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the negotiations for the concession of the Ceylon pearl fisheries during 1904 and part of 1905 were carried on in strict secrecy by means of confidential correspondence without any reference to the people of Ceylon; whether this method of administering the domestic affairs of the Colony and the granting of such a concession to a private company in this manner are contrary to the usual practice in the Colony of openly inviting tenders after public advertisment; whether, of the fourteen members of the Legislative Council who voted for the Ordinance sanctioning the concession, ten were paid officials, three were representatives of non-permanent European communities, one was a Singhalese official in the pay of the Government; and whether the four members who voted against the Ordinance were the only independent Ceylonese non-officials in the council; and whether, during the confidential negotiations with the late Colonial Secretary for the concession, Sir West Ridgeway acted on behalf of a group of South African financiers and mine owners who held a preponderating position on the syndicate and who have the largest holdings in the new company.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I am informed that the communications, being business negotiations, were necessarily confidential, and, in regard to the second part of the Question, that this was not contrary to the usual practice of the Colony. According to the division list, the majority who voted for the Ordinance consisted of seven officials, the officer commanding the troops, the Kandyan representative, who is, it is understood, one of the native headmen and paid in that capacity, and the three European non-official members. The four who voted against it were the representatives of the Low country Sinhalese, the Tamil, the Burgher, and the Mahommedan communities. I have no knowledge as to the last point referred to by the hon. Member.

MR. SMEATON asked the Speaker whether he was entitled to ask the late Colonial Secretary to give information on this extraordinary transaction, which was enshrouded in so much mystery?

*MR. SPEAKER ruled that that would be out of order.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL asked whether, inasmuch as the name of the late Colonial Secretary had been frequently mentioned in connection with this transaction, it would be in order for that right hon Gentleman to make a personal explanation.

*MR. SPEAKER: There is no question of a personal explanation. What the right hon. Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, would be called upon to do would be to expound the policy of the late Government, and that, of course, would lead to some debate.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): Perhaps the House will allow me to state that I did ask the Speaker whether it was in conformity with the rule of the House that I should make a statement on this matter. Mr. Speaker said that it was not. I confess that, without apportioning any blame to the Under-Secretary, he is not precisely the channel through which I should desire my views to be conveyed to the House of Common. It would be a matter of satisfaction to me, inasmuch as this transaction——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The right hon. Gentleman is going to do the very thing I told him he could not do.

MR. LYTTELTON said he would not pursue that point, but instead would ask the Prime Minister, as this matter had been conveyed to the House in sporadic Answers to sporadic Questions, and very incompletely, as he thought, whether he would facilitate the discussion of the subject by giving a day.

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the only day would be that on which the Colonial Vote was taken.

British Indians in East Africa.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether British Indians enjoy the same rights as European colonists in the East African Protectorate in respect of mining, settling, and acquiring land; whether representations to the contrary have been made to the Colonial Office, and, if so, whether they are still pending; and, if they have been disposed of, whether he will inform the House of the result.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is contrary to the policy of His Majesty's Government to exclude any class of His Majesty's subjects from mining, settling, and acquiring land in any part of a British Protectorate over which he exerts direct control, but in view of the comparatively limited area in the East African Protectorate suitable for European colonisation, a reasonable discretion is exercised in dealing with applications for land on the part of natives of India and other non-Europeans. It appears from a despatch which has been recently received from the Commissioner of the Protectorate that a meeting was held by the Indian Community in Mombasa for the purpose of urging on the Government that equal rights should be accorded to Indians and Europeans. This led to a public meeting of the European settlers being held at Nairobi, at which a resolution was passed urging the Imperial Government to reserve for European settlement the only part of the Protectorate suited to Europeans. The resolution has been transmitted by the Colonists' Association to the Secretary of State, who is sending a reply in the sense of the first part of this answer.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): Is the "reasonable discretion" to be such as is sometimes shown by the Under-Secretary?

*MR. REES: Are these British Indians then practically under certain disabilities in this behalf?

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not gather so from the answer.

Religious Services in Malta.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government have sanctioned the action of the Governor of Malta, as set forth in the correspondence recently laid upon the

Table of the House, in preventing the Rev. John McNeill continuing his religious services at the request of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Malta.

Mr. CHURCHILL: As I stated in reply to another Question on June 13th,† the Governor, as the authority responsible for the peace and good order of Malta, exercised his own discretion in the matter of the religious services referred to by the hon. Member, but I will add that, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, the arrangements for preserving the peace and order of Malta should be sufficient to enable all law-abiding persons at all times to perform whatever religious exercises they may choose, irrespective of creed or sect, and instructions have been given with that intention.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT asked whether freedom was to be accorded for all meetings held within doors in future.

Mr. CHURCHILL said he had nothing to add to his Answer.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: The Answer is no answer at all.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I think it is, and that if the hon. Member will study it in the report he will find it made clear even to his comprehension.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: Are Protestant meetings to be allowed to be held indoors in future or are they not?

Mr. BELLOC (Salford, S.) asked whether there was not a definite compact between the people of Malta and the Government of this country to this effect.

Mr. CHURCHILL said he believed that that was not the case, but the British Government had undertaken to respect the religion of the Maltese and not to subvert it, and it was the intention of the Government that there should be equal treatment as between persons of all religious denominations.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.) asked whether representations had been made to the Governor of Malta that the disabilities of Protestants should be removed at once.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I understand that instructions have been given with that intention.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT asked the hon. Gentleman whether he would lay on the Table of the House the communication made to the Governor of Malta.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): I rise to a point of order, Sir. The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, in answer to a supplementary Question, observed that he believed that his written Answer would be clear even to the intelligence of the hon. Gentleman behind me. I wish to ask you, Sir, whether it is in accordance with the traditions of this House that that kind of reply should be given by a Minister of the Crown.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot say that the expression was unparliamentary, although it was certainly provocative and somewhat offensive.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: Will the hon. Gentleman be good enough to answer my Question, whether the communication of the Government to the Governor of Malta will be laid on the Table of the House?

Mr. CHURCHILL: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will give me notice of that.

Public Meetings in Eastern Bengal.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that, notwithstanding the assurances given that the Government of Eastern Bengal and Assam have withdrawn all restrictions on public meetings and processions imposed by previous orders, other circulars have been promulgated by the local magistrates and district superintendents of police which direct that all persons wishing to hold a public meeting or procession must apply to the police for permission to hold such meeting or procession, and that acting under these orders the police have arrested and retained in custody, until they were released on heavy bail, respectable gentlemen who were attending religious processions; and whether he will take measures to ensure that real effect is given to the pledges made in this House.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 956.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The licences for processions and meetings are required under the ordinary law, and the instructions of the local government are that such licences are only to be withheld in cases where there would, if they were granted, be serious risk of breaches of the peace. As I stated in reply to a Question on the 27th June,[†] I will take whatever steps may appear to be necessary to ensure that these instructions are not disregarded.

Swadeshi Movement.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the orders passed by the inspector of schools, Dacca Division, in the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, directing that teachers of schools who are interesting themselves in the Swadeshi movement shall be dismissed, and that the right of holding and competing for Government scholarships shall be permanently withdrawn from schools in which the teachers are so interested; and whether he will take steps to cancel these orders.

MR. MORLEY: I have at present no information as to the orders stated to have been passed, but I have telegraphed to the Government of India on the subject.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the frequent Government prosecutions which have been, and still are being, instituted in the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam against schoolboys and others in connection with the Swadeshi movement; and whether, as a political measure tending to allay the unrest in that province, he will issue instructions through the Government of India to the local government to refrain from endeavouring to repress the movement by prosecution of this nature.

MR. MORLEY: In cases in which the measures adopted by the adherents of the Swadeshi or any other movement involved serious breaches of the ordinary law, the hon. Member will, I think, agree that the authorities have no alternative but to take cognisance of them; but police interference will be limited to what is strictly necessary.

Examinations in Indian Languages.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will lay upon the Table the amended regulations for examinations in Indian languages recently issued by the Government of India.

MR. MORLEY: The regulations are hardly of sufficient general interest to warrant their being laid upon the Table, and they are already in the Library. But I shall be glad to provide the hon. Member with a copy of these Regulations.

Eastern Bengal Legislative Council.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether it is intended to give the planting interest alternate representation only upon the Legislative Council of Eastern Bengal and Assam; and whether, in that case, he will, in view of the magnitude of the interests involved and of the benefits accruing to the province from the cultivation of tea, provide for the continuous representation of the industry.

MR. MORLEY: I have no official information as to the intentions of the Lieutenant-Governor in this matter. The regulations under which the Legislative Council will be constituted do not preclude the continuous representation of the planting interest, and I have no doubt that that interest will receive the fullest representation which is consistent with a due regard for other claims.

Partition of Bengal.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to a public manifesto put forward by the leaders of public opinion in both provinces of Bengal, including seven gentlemen who have been or now are representative members of the Legislative Council, giving expression to the feeling of unrest which is prevailing in these provinces, due to the partition of Bengal, and to the measures which have been adopted to stamp out popular opposition to the partition and to suppress the Swadeshi movement; and whether he will give his consideration to the views expressed therein and take steps to remedy the grievances complained of.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, clix., 927.

MR. MORLEY: I have seen the manifesto referred to. As I have already stated in this House, His Majesty's Government regard the partition of Bengal as a settled fact; but it is my wish to deal in a spirit of full consideration with all questions arising out of it. I shall be glad in the future, as I have been in the past, to take any possible steps for the removal of legitimate causes of complaint.

Tibet.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has refused permission to the eminent Swedish traveller, Dr. Sven Hedin, who is now in India, to enter Tibet; if so, upon what grounds this refusal has been based; whether it is in accordance with the advice of the Government of India; and whether he will consider the advisability, in the interests of friendly relations with the Tibetan Government and people, of encouraging, subject to their consent, the occasional visits of well-qualified travellers to a country enjoying Treaty relations with the British Government.

MR. MORLEY: Dr. Sven Hedin has been refused permission to enter Tibet from British territory. It had been decided for reasons of policy that not even British parties could be allowed to explore Tibet; and what had been refused to British subjects could not be conceded to foreigners. It is true that the Government of India were in favour of encouraging the exploration of Tibet by qualified travellers. His Majesty's Government after full consideration decided otherwise, as they considered it advisable that Tibet should continue in that state of "isolation," the maintenance of which was stated by Mr. Brodrick in his despatch of December 2nd, 1904, to have been one of the main objects of His Majesty's late Government in their dealings with Tibet. A subsidiary reason was that there was no ground for thinking that the Tibetan Government—whose consent to explorations is recognised by the noble Earl to be necessary—would be more disposed to grant passports now than they were in the summer of 1905, when they refused a request for one. I should add that the decision of His Majesty's Government in no way affects the right of access to the trade marts secured by the Lhasa Convention. I should also like to express the regret with which I was compelled recently to refuse applications from the Royal Geographical Society and the Royal Scottish Geographical Society for assistance in the work of exploring Tibet. The claims of scientific explorers obviously stand on a different footing from those of persons who wish to visit Tibet for amusement. Still, even geography must wait upon the requirements of political convenience.

EARL PERCY: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it would be inconsistent with his desire to maintain the isolation of Tibet that the policy which he has announced to the House should, at all events, be modified in the case, not only of British subjects, but also of foreigners, where there is clear evidence that the Tibetan people have no objection whatever to their entrance to the country?

MR. MORLEY: If the noble Lord can establish his proposition that there is clear evidence that the Tibetans do not object, I shall be very glad to receive it; and if I do receive it, I will urge His Majesty's Government to change their policy.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) asked whether China, as the suzerain Power, alone had the right to give or refuse entrance to Tibet.

MR. MORLEY: I do not think I can answer that question.

H. J. Penson, Indian Remount Department.

MR. SEARS (Cheltenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that H. J. Penson, late Sub-conductor of the Remount Department, was instructed by the India Office on November 29th, 1900, to apply through his late superior officer in India for an official certificate of service and character on his retirement; that although application was made, no certificate has been received, and it is now stated that such certificates are not issued; is he aware that when Penson applied to the War Office for employment he received a letter dated January 3rd, 1906, asking for his certificate of retirement; that he has been refused civil employment for want of such certificate; and will he make inquiries with a view to such certificate being issued without further delay.

MR. MORLEY: As the hon. Member was informed on June 11th last,† "parchment" certificates of discharge are not issued to warrant officers of Indian Army Departments. I will ask the Government of India to obtain a certificate of service and character for pensioned Subconductor Penson from his late commanding officer in India.

Abyssinian Railway.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any preliminary agreement between France and Great Britain as to the Abyssinian Railway, has been reached; and, if so, whether the consent of the Emperor of Ethiopia has been obtained, or is expected.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): Negotiations on the subject are still proceeding, and I am unable at present to make any statement on the subject.

The Denshawi Affray.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Egyptian Ministry of the Interior, acting under the advice of Mr. Machell, issued an official report of the facts of the Denshawi affray case, as presented by the Government at the trial, a week or some days before such trial took place; if so, whether, in view of the effect of such publication upon the public mind in Egypt and in England, and in view of the possibility of prejudicing the Court before which the trial was held, he will explain why this course was adopted; whether the trial was held under the special Khedivial Decree of 1895 and the Court duly constituted in accordance with such decree, and all the members thereof thoroughly familiar with the Arabic tongue, both written and spoken, and duly qualified in criminal law: whether, under the Egyptian native penal code, flogging is permitted for any offence whatever, and if he will state whether such flogging is permitted under the Decree of 1895; whether there was any preliminary investigation, and, if so, whether the prisoners, or any of them, were represented thereat by counsel, and whether such investigation was held in public or in private, and whether at the preliminary investigation, if any, and at the trial, counsel for the prisoners were permitted to cross-examine the witnesses for the prosecution, or whether all questions were put to the witnesses by the President of the Court.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether flogging is permitted by the penal code of Egypt; and, if so, by what article of the code, and as a punishment for what offences.

SIR EDWARD GREY: In view of the very incorrect reports which were being circulated in the Press, a preliminary statement of the facts, so far as they were then known, was given to the Press by the Ministry of the Interior on June 17th. The trial was held under the Khedivial Decree of 1895, and the Court was duly constituted in accordance with that Decree. The English Members of the Court were specially chosen on account of their knowledge of Arabic, and all except the military member, who was specially selected for his knowledge of Arabic and his experience of such matters, were technically as well as thoroughly qualified in criminal law. Flogging is no longer allowed under the ordinary criminal law, and no stipulation as to the character of the punishment to be inflicted is laid down in the Decree of 1895. The Decree of 1895 lays down that a preliminary investigation shall take place, on the termination of which the case shall be brought publicly before the Court. I have no official information as to the other points mentioned in the Question, but they will be dealt with in the full Report which has been asked for. I should like to add, as Captain Machell's name is mentioned in this Question and was mentioned the other day, that, while any responsibility that Captain Machell had in the matter cannot be pronounced upon until the full Report has been received, I have asked Lord Cromer about him, and I am told by him that there is probably no European in Egypt who is more popular with Egyptians and whose character stands higher.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 696.

MR. PAUL (Northampton) asked when his right hon. friend expected to receive the despatch for which he had asked.

SIR EDWARD GREY: A full Report of the judgment is on its way, and a full Report, I imagine also, of the execution of the sentences. The evidence, which I also promised, extends to 200 pages of Arabic, which have to be translated, and obviously I cannot expect to have that as early as the other Reports.

MR. DILLON asked, inasmuch as the Decree of 1895 did not specifically mention the right of the special tribunal to give punishments not possible under the ordinary law of Egypt, on what principle the special tribunal acted?

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Decree, if I remember aright—I can give the quotation later on if necessary—gives the Court full discretion as to the punishments to be inflicted.

MR. PICKERSGILL asked whether, with the other Papers, the right hon. Gentleman would include a translation of the Khedivial Decree of 1895?

SIR EDWARD GREY: Yes, Sir, there will be no difficulty about doing that.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Denshawi trials and executions were not arranged for under the direction of Lord Cromer; whether Lord Cromer has not been in England for some days; and, if so, why it is necessary to send to Egypt for detailed information on these matters.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Lord Cromer had left Egypt before the special tribunal had concluded their investigations. In any case, the arrangements connected with the trial and the executions of the sentences were primarily under the authority of the Egyptian Government, and not under that of His Majesty's Representative in Egypt.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether an appeal to the Court of Native Appeal from the judgment of the special tribunal was not allowed in the Mombasa case in July, 1900; and who was responsible for the non-allowance of an appeal in the Denshawi case.

SIR EDWARD GREY: In the case of the assault on two British officers at Montazah, in July, 1900, proceedings were instituted against the two principal offenders before the ordinary tribunals, and not before the special tribunal as in the present case. Article 4 of the Khedivial Decree of 1895, lays down that there shall be no appeal from the judgment pronounced by the special tribunal.

Law of Trespass in Egypt.

MR. PICKERSGILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what was the outcome of the promise made by Lord Cromer in 1901, after the fracas near Cairo between British officers and the watchmen of Mr. Wilfrid Blunt, that he would consult the legal advisers of the Egyptian Government as to the suggested strengthening of the law of trespass in Egypt, so as to protect native cultivators from injury at the hands of Europeans; and whether anything has been done in the premises.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Lord Cromer consulted the legal advisers to the Egyptian Government on his return to Cairo in 1901, and they were of opinion that no change in the law was necessary or practicable. Nor is there reason to believe that cases of trespass by Europeans are more common than cases of trespass by natives.

British Fleets in Russian Ports.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the Russian people are interpreting the meaning of the proposed visit of British warships to Russian ports to be that the British Government sympathises with the methods adopted by the Russian authorities for the suppression of the reform movement; and whether, under these circumstances, he will intervene to stop the visit from taking place.

SIR EDWARD GREY: If an impression exists in the minds of any section of the Russians that the visit of the Fleet is to be regarded as having any reference to internal affairs in Russia, it is quite incorrect; and if it is desired that the Answers hitherto given should be amplified, I will do so in debate.

Slavery on the West Coast of Africa.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if his attention has been drawn to allegations of slavery carried on in the islands of St. Thomé and Principé, on the West Coast of Africa; and what steps he purposes to take to direct the attention of the Portuguese Government to the alleged practices.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The attention of the Portuguese Government has from time to time been called to the conditions under which labour is obtained for the islands of St. Thomé and Principé. Mr. Nightingale, His Majesty's Consul for the Congo, recently paid a visit to the islands referred to for the purpose of enquiring into the matter, and a Report from him on the subject is expected shortly.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Will the Report be laid on the Table of the House?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I must see it before I can decide that.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been drawn to allegations that slave trade is carried on in the cocoa plantations in the islands of St. Thomé and Principé, under the dominion of the Portuguese Government; is he aware that the produce of these islands is chiefly cocoa, which is almost entirely purchased by British merchants; and what steps does he propose taking in the matter.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): Cocoa is no doubt one of the principal products of the islands, and is largely purchased by British merchants. I do not see that any steps can be taken respecting purchases of cocoa by British merchants.

Metropolitan Police Sunday Duty.

*MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he would be prepared to allow members of the Metropolitan Police Force the privilege which the members of the City Police enjoy, of performing their Sunday duties in one tour; and whether he would grant constables of the Metroplitan Police Force the same amount of annual leave as London postmen get, namely, fourteen days.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The conditions on Sunday in the inner portions of the Metropolitan Police District are widely different from those prevailing in the City, and after consultation with the Commissioner of Police I am satisfied that it would not be desirable in the public interest to arrange for the performance of duty in a single tour of eight hours. With regard to the latter part of the Question, I fear I can add nothing to the reply which I gave on May 14th last to the hon. Member for North Lambeth† and to my remarks in the debate on the Metropolitan Police Estimates on June 7th.‡

Private Burying Grounds.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether there is any official record of the number of private burying grounds attached to monastic and conventual institutions; and whether he can state the conditions on which permission to use such private burying grounds is granted.

*MR. GLADSTONE: There is not, to my knowledge, any such record, nor am I aware that any permission to use such grounds is required except in the case of a proposed new ground in a place where, in pursuance of the Burial Acts and Orders in Council thereunder for the protection of the public health, no new burial ground may be opened without the approval of the Local Government Board.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clvii., 181.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 601, 603.

MR. SLOAN: Does the right hon. Gentleman consider it right and proper that no official record should be kept of these places?

*MR. GLADSTONE was understood to to reply that he had not considered that point.

MR. CORBETT: Has any one a right to use a private burial ground without special leave?

*MR. GLADSTONE: That is a matter which is regulated by Act of Parliament.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman say more?

*MR. GLADSTONE said he would make further inquiry if the hon. Member would tell him exactly what he wanted.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): We will furnish the hon. Member with a burying ground if that is what he wants.

Sweated Industries.

MR. J. W. TAYLOR (Durham, Chester-le-Street): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that the provisions of the Factory Act, 1901, Section 116, relating to particulars of work and wages, have already been applied to only about half of the forty odd home industries actually demonstrated at the recent sweating exhibition, held at Queen's Hall; and whether he will favourably consider the question of extending the protection of this section to all outworkers.

*MR. GLADSTONE: A very large proportion of outworkers have been brought within the scope of the particular section; but I am aware that a number of small industries are still outside, and inquiries with regard to many of these, including some represented at the exhibition, have been in progress and are nearly completed. As soon as the Reports of these inquiries are received, the question of extending the section to the industries in question will be considered.

Ecclesiastical Discipline.

MR. PAUL (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has observed the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners on Ecclesiastical Discipline, that the Houses of Laymen should be consulted; what is the composition of these Houses; and whether they have any legal sanction, authority, or existence.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, sir. There is in each province a House of laymen composed of lay members of the Church of England elected according to a system based upon population in the various dioceses. So far as I am aware, they are voluntary bodies and possess no legal *status*.

MR. PAUL: Is not the only body which represents the Church of England as a whole this House?

[No Answer was returned.]

Royal Commission on London Traffic Report.

SIR W. EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): On behalf of my hon. friend the Member for the Hoxton division of Shoreditch, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade why the last volume of the Report of the Royal Commission on London Traffic was in possession of the Press and published in various newspapers last week, and was not on Tuesday available for Members of this House.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I beg to Answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. I understood that abstracts of this volume were sent to the Press on the strength of an assurance from the printers that it would be issued last Saturday. The printers unexpectedly failed to carry out this promise, and it was then too late to withdraw the abstracts. The volume consists of diagrams, statistics, and other appendices, and is of course on a different footing to the Report of the Commission. The incident seems to be of little importance.

Women Agitators.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware of the sentence of six weeks imprisonment by the magistrate at Marylebone on three women for an alleged disturbance in Cavendish Square, and if he is also aware that one of the women is sixty-four years of age and of very respectable character, and if he proposes to take any action in the matter.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, Sir. I am aware of this case, and I have been in communication with the learned magistrate. I find that the three defendants were urged by him to give him an assurance that they would not repeat their conduct, and that on their refusal to do so he ordered them to enter into their recognisances in £50 each to keep the peace for twelve months, and to find a surety each in the same amount. They will only be obliged to go to prison for six weeks if they decline to enter into these recognisances and to find these sureties. Hitherto they have refused, but I am informed that they are well able to do so if they choose. In these circumstances I do not propose to take any action in the matter.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Do not two of the defendants deny that, although they were in the square, they committed any offence?

*MR. GLADSTONE: That is not a question for me.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I shall raise the question on the adjournment.

Salisbury Railway Accident—Drivers and Scheduled Time.

*MR. WARDLE (Stockport): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, having regard to the accident which occurred at Salisbury recently, and seeing that drivers on the London and South Western Railway are punished by reduction in pay and position for failing to keep to the scheduled time of trains, whether he proposes to take any steps, by legislation or otherwise, to prevent the continuance of this practice.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I am informed by the railway company in question that engine drivers who are found not to run their trains in accordance with schedule times are removed to other trains and that this may sometimes involve reduction of pay. The company state that such cases are rare, and that men are so removed only when they are found incompetent for the post to which they have been assigned, and unable to maintain the time which is easily kept by other drivers. It is added that drivers who improperly run faster than schedule time are similarly dealt with. Pending receipt of the Report of the inspector appointed to inquire into the Salisbury accident, I am not in a position to say what steps, if any, are desirable on the part of the Board of Trade.

*MR. WARDLE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what the state of mind of a driver must be if he is fined both for not keeping time and for attempting to make it up?

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman can have no knowledge of that.

Birmingham Railway Fatality.

*MR. WARDLE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the death of Mr. Thomas Yardley at Vauxhall Station, London and North Western, Birmingham, by accident on June 26th, and to the verdict of the jury that proper provision was not made by the company's officials to protect Yardley's life, the rules laid down by the company having been infringed; and, if so, will he say what he proposes to do in the matter.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, Sir. The Board of Trade have received a report of the fatal accident in question, and also a copy of the verdict and rider of the coroner's jury. I am ordering an inquiry into the circumstances of the accident to be held on behalf of the Board.

Seamen's Wages.

MR. L. HASLAM (Monmouth Boroughs): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, having regard to the fact that, under The Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, the act of desertion on the part of a seaman renders him liable to the forfeiture of the whole of his accumulated wages, however large the amount may be, and also to the forfeiture of all the other effects he has left on board ship, will he state what becomes of the money thus forfeited, and how much of it, if any, was paid into the national Exchequer during 1905; and will he introduce an Amendment into the Merchant Shipping Bill now before the House by which the amount of wages to be forfeited for desertion may be limited in amount.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Under the present law (which, as my hon. friend is aware, it is proposed to amend by the Bill now before this House), the wages earned by a seaman up to the date of his desertion are usually retained by the master on behalf of the owner, but in cases where a court is appealed to either on behalf of a seaman or an owner, it rests with the court to decide what amount shall be re-imbursed to the owners for the expenses caused by the desertion, and the balance is paid into the Exchequer. I regret that I am not able without further notice to state what amount was so paid into the Exchequer during 1905, but I have no doubt that it was only a small sum. With regard to the Amendment to the Merchant Shipping Bill suggested by my hon. friend, I doubt the advisability of limiting the amount of wages which can be forfeited for desertion, as such a limit would tend to weaken the inducements which a seaman has to stay by his vessel.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): When will the Report stage of the Bill be taken?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I should prefer that that Question be addressed to the Leader of the House.

"Banking" Trains.

*MR. WARDLE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the practice of banking passengers and other trains up inclines on the London and North Western and Midland Railways, without either the engine in the rear being coupled to the train in front or any continuous brake connection being formed; and whether, in view of the possibility of accident to the front engine or train, and with a view to securing safe working, especially at night, he will say what steps he proposes to take, if any, to avoid such risk.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am aware that this method of working trains is adopted at some places on the railways mentioned, and the companies inform me that, after full consideration and long experience, they are of opinion that it is safe and unobjectionable. The inspecting officers of railways agree that where an assistant engine is used with a goods train not fitted with continuous brakes, the necessity for coupling does not arise, and that it is often desirable to place the assistant engine in the rear as a safeguard against a break-away. But their view has been that, in the case of passenger trains, the proper place for the assistant engine is in front of the train and coupled on, the brake connection being made throughout. In practice, however, no accidents have for many years past occurred on the railways in question from the practice adopted by the companies, and I am not at present prepared to take any action in the matter.

Filial Liabilities.

*MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the fact that in many rural Poor Law districts sons whose weekly wages are 13s. or even less per week are compelled to contribute towards the cost of Poor Law relief to their indigent parents, he will issue recommendations to such Poor Law authorities discouraging such demands; or whether he proposes shortly to introduce legislation, fixing a minimum scale of income below which a son or daughter may not legally be called upon to contribute to parental support.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): Children are only liable to contribute to the maintenance of their parents when, being of sufficient ability to make a contribution, they are required by an order of justices to do so. Any question as to the ability of a son or daughter to contribute is a matter for the justices when application is made to them for an order. I have not received complaints of harshness in the enforcement of the law on this subject, and I am not at present aware of any sufficient ground for taking action of the kind suggested by my hon. friend.

Glasgow Post Office Revision.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General what is the cause of the delay in carrying out at Glasgow the revision of allowances to head postmen recommended in the Tweedmouth Report, dated March, 1897; and, seeing that the matter has been the subject of official investigation for the last five years, whether a decision will be shortly come to.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): This is not a question of a revision of allowances recommended by the Tweedmouth Report. Applications for increased allowances have been made from time to time, and have been under consideration, and I have made a recommendation to the Treasury which, if approved, will, I hope, settle the matter.

School Curriculum.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education, with reference to the Code of Regulations for Public Elementary Schools, 1906, Curriculum, Clause 7, whether he can see his way to amend the recommendation that teaching need not be limited to English or British history, and lessons on citizenship may be given with advantage in the higher classes, so as to make the teaching of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship compulsory for all children in the higher standards.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): The Article setting out the curriculum for public elementary schools is designed to leave the necessary liberty to local education authorities and managers and teachers for considering the circumstances of individual schools, and the qualifications of individual teachers in framing their plans of lessons. Any rigid obligation to give lessons on citizenship in the higher standards of all schools indiscriminately would hardly be a wise regulation in any code. The reference, in the Article referred to, to lessons on citizenship clearly indicates, I think, that the subject is one which the Board regard as of high educational value. I may add that three suggested schemes for instruction in history to scholars in the higher classes will be found in Appendix IV. of the "Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools," and that lessons on citizenship are provided for in all these three schemes.

The Education Grant.

MR. W. HOPE (Somersetshire, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can state when the regulations for the distribution of the £1,000,000 under Clause 12 of the Education Bill will be issued.

MR. LOUGH: I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer given to a Question by the Member for Cambridge University on June 27th † upon this matter, to which I have nothing to add.

Whitburn Beach.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the attention of the Office of Woods has been called to the state of the beach at Whitburn, near Sunderland, due to the tipping of refuse from several collieries in the locality, such refuse consisting of slate and broken bricks, and spoiling the beach as a pleasure resort; and whether it is their intention to take any action in regard to the matter?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The attention of the Commissioners of Woods had not been previously drawn to the tipping of colliery refuse on the foreshore. I understand that the tipping, which takes place about a mile north of the village of Whitburn, has gone on for many years. No complaint of its having any injurious effect has been received by the Commissioners of Woods. In the absence of any general expression of local feeling I do not propose to take immediate action, but, of course, I shall always be ready to consider any complaints and, if necessary, to require the discontinuance of the practice.

Parochial Assessments.

MR. SEARS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will cause inquiry to be made to ascertain the percentage of assessments made by parochial assessors which the surveyors of taxes, in the time at their disposal, revise and amend before they can be transmitted to the clerks to commissioners; and will he also ascertain the percentage of assessments which have to be amended after issue of notices to pay and before payment is made.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 919.

MR. MCKENNA: Under Sections 51, 52 and 56 of the Taxes Management Act, 1880, it is the duty of a surveyor of taxes to examine every return and every assessment delivered by assessors in the years (every fifth year) in which new property tax and house duty assessments are made. It would hardly be possible, at any rate it would involve enormous labour, to go through the 15,000,000 or thereabouts of assessments and to determine the percentage of corrections made by surveyors. As regards the latter part of the Question, in the last year of a new assessment, 1903–4, the number of assessments, as finally settled, was over 13,000,000, and the percentage of corrections after issue of notices to pay was 1·6 per cent.

Dog Tax.

MR. SEARS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the saving in poundage, etc., of £6,500 a year on a revenue of less than £250,000 which the Board of Inland Revenue say, in their twelfth Report, was effected by the transfer of the management of the dog tax from parochial to Government officers, in addition to the increase in the number of dogs brought to charge under the new system, and to a saving of £60,000 a year in poundage, etc., from a further transfer of assessed taxes in 1869; will he cause an inquiry to be made to ascertain whether similar saving would result from the substitution of Government for parochial officers in connection with the taxes still in the hands of such officers.

MR. MCKENNA: Against the saving of £60,000, there was a substantial set-off by increased cost for the Excise Staff. At the same time, the changes made in 1867 and 1869 were unquestionably of advantage both to efficiency and economy. If they were not carried further, nor any proposal made to carry them further, it may be inferred that it was not considered at the time that advantage would result from carrying them further. At any rate, that is the conviction of the present Board and of its advisers at the present time.

MR. SEARS: Can the hon. Gentleman give the actual amounts of the set-off.

MR. MCKENNA: I cannot.

Trial by Jury.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether, having regard to the frequent disagreement of juries in England, he will consider the advisability of introducing legislation to adopt the same system in jury trails in that country that takes place in Scotland, where three verdicts are possible, and the verdict of the majority is accepted.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) said he quite recognised the greater finality of decision afforded by the Scottish system of jury trials; but he feared that, notwithstanding those advantages, the people of this country preferred their own ancient system, which, if it erred at all, erred in the direction of maintaining the presumption of innocence, and preserving liberty. Those were objects with which he entirely sympathised.

Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if his attention has been directed to the fact that the Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew, are not open to the public before 1 p.m. on Sundays, so that they are inaccessible upon the only morning in which the majority of the taxpayers are able to enjoy them; and if he can give instructions for the hours of admission on Sundays in future to be from 10 a.m. until dusk.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somerset, S.): My noble friend considered this suggestion a few months ago, but he came to the conclusion that, in view of the desirability of limiting Sunday labour and of allowing the employees opportunities of attending public worship on Sunday mornings, he would not be justified in making any alteration in the existing arrangements.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: Will the hon. Gentleman see if arrangements cannot be made to enable the public to enjoy the gardens for which they pay?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I can add nothing to my Answer.

Importation of Cattle into Alderney.

*MR. ESSEX: I beg to ask the hon, Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence between his Board and the syndicate or company which proposes to import into the island of Alderney for slaugher animals from countries from which the importion of animals into Great Britain is for the time prohibited by the Foreign Animals Order, 1903, and its Amendments; and whether, if he cannot lay such correspondence upon the Table, does he propose shortly to make a statement to the House upon this matter.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I shall be glad to supply my hon. friend with a copy of the correspondence in question, for his personal information, and to consider whether any Papers on the subject could be published. I could make a full statement respecting the matter in reply to any Question which might be addressed to me.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Estates—Licences.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Member for East Bristol, as Church Estates Commissioner, the number of licences owned by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and how they are distributed in the various counties; whether the Commissioners grant permission for new licences on their estate; and if they allow licences to lapse on the termination of leases; if so, what number of licences have elapsed during the past ten years.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): The Answer given by the hon. Member for Hallam on March 8th,[†] to a Question put by the hon. Member for West Denbighshire contains the information desired by the hon. Member, except as regards the distribution of licences amongst the various counties. The Commissioners, in view of the time and cost which would be involved, are not prepared to give this information.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON: Will the hon. Member give me the information so far as it is applicable to the county of Durham?

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I will inquire whether I can get that information.

Conversion of Easter Ross Farms into Deer Forests.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the names of the sheep farms in Easter Ross which have been converted into deer forests within the last five years, indicating in each case the acreage of the farm and the name of the proprietor.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): All the information upon this subject which is available to the Government is contained in the Return No. 232 of June 22nd, 1905, but it does not enable me to answer my hon. Friend's Question.

Timolin Evicted Tenant.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners received application for reinstatement in September, 1903, September, 1904, and March, 1906, from Mrs. Kavanagh, whose husband was evicted August 16th, 1888, from a farm of 63 acres, the valuation of which was £85 10s. and the rent £172 10s., on the Deane Drake estate, Timolin, county Kildare, the landlord of which resides at Stokestown House, New Ross, county Wexford; and whether, seeing that the evicted farm is on the landlord's hands, never having been relet, he can say what steps have been taken to restore Mrs. Kavanagh and her family to the farm from which her husband was evicted.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received from Mrs. Kavanagh an application for reinstatement in her former holding on the estate mentioned. The owner has lodged an originating application, under the Act of 1903, for the sale of this estate, including 90 acres at Timolin, apparently the evicted holding, which is in the owner's hands and which he wishes to repurchase under Section 3. The Commissioners recently asked the vendor whether he was prepared to sell any portion of the lands to them for the purpose, if considered desirable, of resale to Mrs. Kavanagh, and he replied that he was not prepared to sell any portion of the lands for that purpose. The Commissioners have not yet ruled on the application, and the inspector will enquire into and report upon the circumstances of the case when he visits the estate in order of priority.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 603 *et seq.*

Mr. KILBRIDE: Has the attention of the right hon. Gentleman been directed to the fact that the rent in this case is 100 per cent. over the valuation ?

Mr. BRYCE: I am sure the Estates Commissioners will do all they can in the matter.

Wicklow Magistrates.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what is the Catholic and Protestant population respectively of the county of Wicklow; the number of Catholic magistrates and Protestant magistrates, exclusive of ex-officio, in the same county; the number of Catholic and Protestant magistrates appointed for the same county from the 1st July, 1895, to the 12th January 1906.

Mr. BRYCE: According to the last census, the Catholic population of county Wicklow numbered 48,083, and the Protestant population, 12,470. I am informed by the Lord Chancellor's Department that the number of magistrates in the county is 129, of whom twenty-two are believed to be Catholics, and 107 Protestants. The number appointed between 1st July, 1895, and 12th January, 1906, is forty-two, of whom three are believed to be Catholics and thirty-nine Protestants.

Kilfinane National School.

Mr. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will consider the application of the manager of the national school at Kilfinane, county Limerick, and see whether the circumstances of it justify him in giving it the benefit of the exceptional treatment which he has promised to the school at Lillavullen, county Cork.

Mr. BRYCE: I will bring the case of Kilfinane school to the notice of the Commissioners in order that they may consider whether the circumstances of the school constitute such a case of urgency as I referred to.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that owing to the inadequate accommodation at this school a large percentage of the children have, in wintry weather to be kept waiting in a shed outside the school. Is not that a reason for urgency ?

Mr. BRYCE: Yes, it is a reason why the Commissioners should deal with the matter as soon as possible.

Bruff Evicted Tenant

Mr. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the inspector appointed by the Irish Land Commission to look into the claims of the evicted tenants in the county of Limerick has been instructed to investigate the claim to reinstatement to her farm of Mrs. Hartigan; is he aware that this farm, situated at Ballynanty, Bruff, county Limerick, had been in the possession of the Hartigan family for 200 years, and had been rented by the father of the late tenant at 12s. per acre, but on being improved by him was raised by the landlord to £3 5s. per acre, with a fine of £500; and will the inspector be instructed to mediate between Mrs. Hartigan and her landlord, J. C. Wilmot-Smith, The Hall, Boroughbridge, Yorkshire, with a view to an arrangement.

Mr. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that an application for reinstatement has been received from Mrs. Anne Hartigan, and will, with others of a similar nature, be inquired into by an inspector in due course. The Commissioners have, at Mrs. Hartigan's request, already approached the landlord, and have been informed by him that Patrick Hartigan, the former tenant, was not evicted from his farm but gave up possession in 1888 when he owed a very large amount of rent. The landlord states that he is now farming the land himself, and does not intend to sell it.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford,): Has the right hon. Gentleman informed himself as to the correctness of the facts stated in the Question and of the circumstances of the case, namely, is it a fact that this tenant has expended over £1,000 on the improvement of the farm, and when the lease fell in the rent was raised from 20s. to 65s. per acre, and under the circumstances will not the Estates Commissioners act as arbitrators in order to have a settlement carried out?

MR. BRYCE: These facts are not within my knowledge, but it is very proper that they should be brought to the knowledge of the Commissioners who will investigate them.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I hope their attention will be called to the facts as stated.

Fair Rent Appeals.

*MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a resolution from the Cavan Board of Guardians requesting the Government to appoint an additional Judicial Commissioner to dispose of the appeals in fair rent cases in the Land Commission Court, which have remained unheard for years, and asking that the Judge who shall be appointed shall have no connection with the landlord's interests, but shall be independent; and will this matter be dealt with at once.

MR. BRYCE: I have received the resolution referred to. I have ascertained from the Land Commission that during the past six years the number of appeals annually lodged has steadily diminished, the number lodged last year being less than half the number lodged six years ago. During the same period, the number of appeals annually disposed of has steadily increased, the number disposed of last year being 2,000 more than were disposed of in the year 1900–1. The net result is that the number of appeals pending on March 31st last was very much smaller than the number outstanding six years ago. It may, I think, be assumed that with the progress of land purchase the number of outstanding appeals will continue to diminish. The question whether it may be necessary to appoint an additional Judicial Commissioner is, nevertheless, one which deserves consideration, but I am not at present in a position to make any statement on the subject.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman inform the House as to the number of outstanding appeals at the present moment: do they not amount to nine or ten thousand, and will it not take a considerable period of time—some years indeed—before they can be disposed of?

MR. BRYCE: My impression is that they number 9,400.

*MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that of the 9,000 or 10,000 appeals at present pending more than one half are from two to six years lodged, and is he not aware that this serious delay is entirely to the prejudice of the tenant and does not affect the landlord?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Inasmuch as this matter seriously affects the working of the Land Purchase Act, will the right hon. Gentleman see if steps can be taken to remedy this state of things?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Does not the Act provide for the appointment of an additional Judicial Commissioner?

MR. BRYCE: It authorises the bringing in of one of the Judges of the High Court to act as an additional Commissioner. There is no doubt that the great delay which has occurred is very much to be regretted.

MR. FLAVIN: Is it not a fact that many landlords refuse to sell until the appeals have been disposed of?

MR. BRYCE: I am not aware of that.

Clonfin (Longford) Estate.

Mr. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Longford I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. John L. Thompson, nominal owner of the Clonfin (county Longford) Estate was willing to sell his interest to the tenants on the Clonfin Estate; that this offer was communicated to the Scottish Union and National Insurance Company, the mortgagees in possession, but they never replied to the tenant's request; and whether, seeing that this is an insolvent estate within the meaning of the Act of 1903, steps will be taken by the Estates Commissioners to purchase the same.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how many writs and processes have been served within the past five years on tenants on the estate of John M. Thompson, Clonfin, county Longford; whether he is aware that these tenants have been brought to the verge of bankruptcy by Mr. Deane, the receiver under the Court; and, if so, will steps be taken at once to take the management of this estate out of the hands of Mr. Deane.

Mr. BRYCE: I have referred these questions both to the Land Judge's Court and to the Estates Commissioners. The Registrar of the Court informs me that, so far as can be ascertained, there is no Court receiver over the estate mentioned. The suggestion made in the first Question that mortgagees are in possession would, if accurate, at once negative the assumption that there is a receiver over the estate. The Estates Commissioners have no knowledge of the facts, but they have, in pursuance of the suggestion made by the hon. Member on June 18th†, entered into communication with the firm of solicitors whom he named as representing the owners of the property. The Commissioners have not yet had any reply, but they are prepared to consider the question of purchase if the owners should be willing to sell.

Crannagh Farm, North Mayo.

Mr. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have approached the owner of the Crannagh farm, in Ardagh, North Mayo, with a view to purchase under the Act of 1903; and, if so, with what result.

Mr. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners are unable to identify the farm referred to from the information given in the Question. If the name of the owner of the estate upon which the farm is situate were furnished to them, they would be in a position to reply to the Question.

King Harman Estate, County Longford.

Mr. CULLINAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Longford, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the sale of the King-Harman Estate at Ballinamuck, county Longford; whether he is aware that in order to meet the view of the majority of the tenants the terms of purchase have been reduced by the Master of the Rolls to twenty-one and a half to twenty years purchase, whilst twenty-four and a half years purchase is asked from the second-term tenants, who are a minority, on the property; and will he request the Estates Commissioners, when sanctioning this sale, to reduce the second-term purchase rental from its present basis of twenty-four and a half years purchase to an equivalent basis of twenty-three years purchase.

Mr. BRYCE: I have referred this Question to the office of the Master of the Rolls, and am informed that the facts are substantially as stated in the Question. The Estates Commissioners inform me that proceedings for the sale of this portion of the King-Harman Estate have not yet been instituted before them, but in the event of such proceedings being instituted they will, before sanctioning any advances for purchase, have a detailed inspection made of the holdings on the estate.

Athy Post Office.

Mr. KILBRIDE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the unsuitability of the post office accommodation in Athy is recognised, and that possible sites for the erection of a new post office were brought under the notice of the postal authorities in February and

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 1348.

May, 1905; and whether, in view of the length of time that the consideration of the matter has taken, and his promise to take steps to acquire the site, he can say what steps have been taken within the last three months, and when he hopes to be able to issue advertisements for tenders for the erection of the new post office.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Yes, I am aware of the circumstances to which the hon. Member refers, and as I mentioned in answering his Question of April 5th last,† steps are being taken to acquire the site; but I am afraid that financial exigencies will not admit of the new building being commenced during the current financial year.

Illegal Practices in the Church.

MR. BYLES: I beg to ask the Prime Minister what action the Government propose to take to restore law and order in the Church of England, and to stay the illegal practices of the bishops and clergy, which are reported by Lord St. Aldwyn's Commission on Church Discipline to be widely prevalent.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): The obvious and adequate reply to my hon. friend is that the Report of the Royal Commission in question was only made public on last Monday.

Musical Copyright Bill.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) asked the Prime Minister whether, in view of the general approval by the House of the Musical Copyright Bill and its acceptance on the part of the Government by the Home Secretary, he would see his way to grant facilities for passing it into law.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said that he, and he thought all his friends, would view a favourable Answer to the Question with great satisfaction.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: A favourable Answer must be expected after what has occurred in relation to this Bill. I believe—although it is impossible to say what a microscope would discover—that there is a general feeling in the House in favour of this Bill passing into law. The Government certainly are favourable to it, and we will do all we can to place it on the Statute-book.

MR. KEIR HARDIE asked whether the Prime Minister would treat the Aliens (Amendment) Bill in the same fashion in the House of Lords.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That Bill is in the other House. It is sufficient to answer for the sins of myself and this House, without taking upon myself responsibility for what happens in another place.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill: Mr. Attorney-General and Mr. Lloyd-George; and had appointed in substitution: The Lord-Advocate and Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure: Mr. Nussey; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. William Henry Hope.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

TOWN TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

The following Motion stood on the Paper in the name of Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN:—"That the proceedings on the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill (Motion for Committal to Standing Committee on Law) be not interrupted this evening under the Standing Orders (Sittings of the House), and may be entered upon and proceeded with at any hour, though opposed."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he desired to address to Mr. Speaker three points of order, relating to the Motion standing in the name of the Prime Minister. The first was whether under the Standing Orders this Motion was one which must be put without Amendment or debate. The Standing Order relevant to the point said that a Motion might be made by a Minister of the Crown at the commencement of public business, to be decided without Amendment or debate, by which the proceedings on any special business if under discussion at eleven o'clock were not to be interrupted. It would be seen that that was not the form which the Government had adopted for their Motion, and he asked whether the Motion was not debatable in character. His second Question, which depended on the Answer to the first Question, was whether if they had a debatable Motion brought on before Supply that would prevent the day being regarded as one of the allotted days for Supply. His third Question was whether under any circumstances it was possible under the Standing Order to take business other than Supply after eleven o'clock on a Supply day.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clv., 749.

*Mr. SPEAKER said that with regard to the first Question he had no doubt this Motion was debatable, because it did not follow the form of words set out in Standing Order No. 1, Sittings of the House. With regard to the second Question, in his opinion as this matter was debatable, it became business, and therefore it would endanger the day being counted as an allotted day. As to the third Question, did the right hon. Gentleman mean business to be taken after eleven o'clock without any special Motion?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he knew that the Standing Order enabled the discussion of business of Supply after eleven o'clock on a Motion of a Minister of the Crown to be taken without debate; but he understood that on no account was it possible to take business on a Supply Day after 11 o'clock if that business were not connected with Supply.

*Mr. SPEAKER said he thought that was the right construction of the ruling. All that the House could do was under Standing Order No. 1 to order that the business under discussion at eleven o'clock could be continued, which meant that the business of Supply could be continued, but that no fresh business could be taken if opposed, without a general order for the suspension of the eleven o'clock rule being in force, or a special order to that effect made on a previous day.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said of course Mr. Speaker's ruling would prevent his making the Motion on the Paper, but he might say there were precedents for a Motion of this sort being taken without discussion by which the Government had been misled.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said, without questioning Mr. Speaker's ruling, which, of course, they could not for a moment do, he would like to say that last session this practice was resorted to more than once by the late Government, and Motions of this kind were carried without discussion. He supposed the House might take it for granted that an early opportunity would be given for bringing forward the Motion to refer the Bill to a Grand Committee.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes; it is our intention.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would bear in mind that it would be adding an additional hardship if he were to introduce the Motion on an Education day.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said it would be in order on an Education day, and it was to avoid inconvenience that the Government put the Motion down for to-day.

NEW WRIT.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY of the TREASURY (Mr. George Whiteley Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) asked Mr. Speaker whether in his opinion the Motion standing in his name (in reference to the issue of a new writ) was likewise a debatable Motion.

*Mr. SPEAKER said it was a question of privilege. The issue of writs was a matter which stood somewhat apart in this House. The issue of writs could be moved from any quarter of the House and always came first. It took that position because it was a matter of privilege, and therefore he did not think this Motion would come within the ruling he had previously given.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) asked whether a Motion for a new writ in a case where there had been a disputed election required two days' notice to be given, and therefore did not come within the question of privilege, as did the ordinary issue of a writ which could be moved at any time.

*MR. SPEAKER said it did not destroy the character of the Motion, which he still thought partook of the nature of privilege.

Motion made, and Question—"That Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a New Writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Cornwall (South Eastern or Bodmin Division), in the room of the Honourable Thomas Charles Reginald Agar-Robartes, whose election has been declared to be void"—(*Mr. George Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

SUPPLY [15TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906–7.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £40,396, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs."

*MR. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet) said he rose to move a reduction of the Vote for the purpose of directing the attention of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to certain judicial and punitive methods which prevailed in the British concessions in China generally, and notably in the settlement of Hankow. These methods, he might at once say, were of a class which had recently received severe condemnation from high authority. They were methods which they had heard in this House the Government regarded with stern disapproval. The facts which he proposed to lay before the Committee, the evidence upon which they were based, and the statistics in reference to them, were not derived from sensational newspaper reports, or based upon mere vague rumour. They were taken from official information and statistics supplied from British official sources. He would divide the subject under two heads; first, flogging with bamboos, and secondly, torture with the cangue. Those were two forms of punishment inflicted upon Chinamen accused of offences against British subjects, and the extent to which they prevailed was very considerable. The cases were not to be counted singly, or by dozens or scores, but by hundreds. He had lately studied the report issued by the superintendent of police at Hankow, a report which had been made to the municipality of Hankow, and he found that in the year 1903, in the mixed Court at Hankow, 907 Chinamen were sentenced to be flogged with the bamboo and eighty-seven to be tortured with the cangue. In 1904, according to the same report, 585 Chinamen were sentenced by the same authority to be flogged with the bamboo and 101 to be tortured with the cangue; and in 1905, 514 Chinamen were sentenced to be flogged with the bamboo and seventy-six to be tortured with the cangue. This flogging with the bamboo was by no means a mild penalty. As inflicted by the mixed Courts at Hankow it was a very severe punishment, and there were cases on record to which he would presently refer where a prisoner had been sentenced to no less than 1,000 blows with the bamboo. The Committee no doubt knew the character of the punishment by the bamboo, but perhaps he might be permitted to say a word as to the form of torture administered with the cangue. The cangue was a wooden collar or portable pillory which the offenders were condemed to carry on their shoulders, for a period ranging from a few days to three months. It was a square wooden collar weighing from twenty to sixty pounds, with a round hole in it for the neck, and it measured from three to four feet across. The convict sentenced to wear this cangue was unable to reach his mouth or to lie down, and he could not even defend himself from insects, and he was, during the time he carried it about, entirely dependent on the good offices of his friends. Men and women were chained together in these cangues, and they were permitted to wander at large through the streets of Hankow, publicly exhibiting the punishment to which they had been sentenced, a punishment which it would at once be seen involved both mental and physical torture. The Chinamen subjected to this barbarous punishment were taken into custody by the police of the municipality of the British community. They were tried in what were called the mixed Courts, held in the Court of the British Consul. The prisoners were tried by a Chinese magistrate, sitting with a British Consular officer as assessor; the latter was described in the proceedings as the British assessor, and he was there to watch the proceedings on behalf of the British police, who were the prosecutors. It might be said that the British assessor could not control the Court or the sentence. He thought that was open to question, because by the agreement of Chefoo in 1876 it was expressly provided that—

> "If the officer so attending is dissatisfied with the proceedings, it will be in his power to protest against them in detail."

Therefore it was not an unfair assumption that the right to protest against these proceedings included the right to protest against the sentence in which those proceedings culminated. It might be said that the punishment and the torture would be inflicted whether the assessor assented to it or not, but it was very much open to doubt whether the dissent of these British assessors from barbarous punishments would be altogether disregarded. It was not at all likely that such sentences would cease to be inflicted so long as the British officials tacitly sanctioned them by their presence in the Courts in which they were passed. So long as these assessors were officially present at the trials they could not claim that they were free from responsibility, and he submitted that their responsibility was directly proportionate to their power. What was their power? They were under no compulsion to be accessories before the fact to the flogging and ill-usage of Chinamen in our concessions in China. Even if it was not deemed advisable to interfere with these established Chinese customs we could at least instruct our consular officials to refrain from being parties to the infliction of punishments which were repugnant to the public sentiment of this country. In Shanghai he believed the punishment by the bamboo had lately been abolished, but so far as he could learn, torture by the cangue was still in force, and in order that the Committee might form some idea of the way in which these punishments were inflicted, he would read a very brief report from the *North China Herald.* It was a report of the proceedings in the mixed Court of Shanghai. The proceedings took place before Mr. King, the Chinese magistrate, and Mr. Twyman, the British assessor who sat with him.

> "Inspector Wilson mentioned the case of a prisoner who was convicted in April last for burglary, and sentenced to five years imprisonment and 1,000 blows—500 to be administered at the beginning of the term, and 500 after the expiration of six months. The prisoner received the first 500 blows, and afterwards became sick, but he was now certified as well enough to receive the remaining blows, and Inspector Wilson asked how the abolition of bambooing would affect this case. There would shortly be before the court a similar case of a prisoner who is sentenced to receive a second instalment of 500 blows, but in this case the man is also undergoing imprisonment for life, and the court will therefore have some difficulty in finding a punishment in substitution for the blows."

He ventured to submit to the Committee that we need not shrink from incurring the resentment of the Chinese if we refused to be any longer parties to these brutal punishments and revolting tortures. If we even exercised pressure in this direction, we should be making better and more honourable use of our power than when we used it for the purposes of gain by forcing the opium trade upon the Chinese people in spite of the protests of their Government and the public opinion of the nation. He did not see how the Government could very well refuse to deal with this question, or, at any rate, to take such steps as were necessary to prevent British consular agents from becoming parties to the infliction of these punishments and tortures. The Government and its more enlightened supporters disapproved of flogging, and upon that point they had had the most emphatic assurances. If the Government disapproved of flogging, then *a fortiori* they could not approve of torture by the cangue. They could not defend these practices, and therefore they could not consistently refuse to use what power they possessed to put an end to them. Surely they could instruct their Consuls to refrain from sitting as assessors in the Courts where these barborous punishments were inflicted. That was a point which he asked the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to consider. He wished to know whether it would not be possible and indeed whether it would not be proper that the Foreign Office should give instructions to their Consuls to refrain from sitting as assessors in the Courts where such barbarities as he had described were inflicted. He sincerely hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to take that course, and he was encouraged in that hope by a very pregnant sentence in a speech which the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs delivered on March 14th last. If he was correctly reported in *Hansard*, the right hon. Gentleman said on that occasion—

> "I think the only right and dignified position for the Imperial Government is to lay down once and for all that the Imperial diplomatic machinery will not be allowed to be used over any part of the Empire for an improper purpose." †

He realised that that sentence was limited by the phrase, "over any part of the Empire." In his opinion the Empire might be said to include His Majesty's Consular Courts in whatever part of the world they might be situated, and if the right hon. Gentleman was of the same mind to-day as he was in March last, then he ought to use his authority to insure that the Imperial diplomatic machinery should not be allowed to be used in any British Court, or in any Court where the British consular official was sitting for purposes which he and the Government did not approve of, or for the infliction of punishment and penalties which were repugnant to the British sense of humanity. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries, Wages, and Allowances) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. H. H. Marks.*)

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said he rose to call the attention of the Committee and the Government to an international question which was exercising the minds not only of the people of this country, but of the people of every civilised country in the world. The question he referred to was the condition of affairs in the Congo Free State, and the remarkable proclamation or manifesto which had lately been issued by the King of the Belgians, who was the Sovereign of the Congo Free State. He wished to call attention to the reforms contained in the decrees which had been issued, and the likely effect of those reforms upon that long train of abuses which had marked the Government of the Congo Free State, a State founded by the approval and with the co-operation of the great Powers of the world. The manifesto published by the King of the Belgians was one which they must separate entirely from the people of Belgium. He desired any remarks he might make to be separated entirely from any question of our relations with the Government of Germany, with whom we were altogether friendly, and with the people, a great many of whom sympathised with the action taken by the British House of Commons in 1903 in passing a Resolution condemnatory of the condition which existed then, and which had existed in an increasing degree during the last twenty years under the so-called civilised government established in the Congo State by Leopold, King of the Belgians. That manifesto was an extraordinary challenge to Europe and to all civilised peoples. He could not imagine in the face of the facts and of what was understood and said by his own people that the Sovereign of the Congo Free State could have done anything else but keep his tongue in his cheek when he published that manifesto to the world. A great civilised nation—the United States—gave the first approval to the International Association of the Congo which the King of the Belgians established, not for the purpose set forth in the manifesto, but for the purpose of developing civilisation in those free States as they were called. They were called "free" because they were to be left open to all international commerce and trade. The word was not used in order to suggest freedom constitutionally from the opinion or influence or the right to interfere on the part of the nations which helped to establish the Congo Free State. The United States, through President Arthur, in 1883 said—

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 1291.

> "The objects of this Society are philanthropic; it does not aim at permanent political control, but seeks the neutrality of the valley."

It was doubtful whether the Congo Free State would have been established with King Leopold at its head but for the approval given by the President of the United States, followed by the agreement which England entered into with the head of the Congo Free State, who was also head of the Association. That agreement established without any shadow of doubt that British subjects and the subjects of all other nations should have the fullest right to trade within the boundaries of the Congo Free State. Then came the Berlin Conference and the Berlin Act, which established the right set forth in Article 26, namely—

> "The Powers signatories of the present general Act reserve to themselves the right of eventually, by mutual agreement, introducing therein modifications or improvements, the utility of which has been shown by experience."

That was the charter of our right to intervene in the affairs of the Congo Free State, over which Belgium had no more control than we had. Mr. Van der Velde had said—

> "We have been told of money, profits, presents, made to Belgium. I say that this money, these profits, these presents, are shameful, because they are the result of exploitation of a whole people."

Other members of the Belgian Chamber had expressed their views even more strongly than Mr. Van der Velde. In spite of the position held by this country, the United States, Germany, Italy, and France in connection with the development of that State, the King of the Beglians said—

> "My rights on the Congo are indivisible, they are the result of my toil, and of the expenditure of my money. It is essential that I should proclaim these rights aloud, for Belgium does not possess any in the Congo except those which emanate from me. If I am careful not to allow my rights to lapse, it is because Belgium, without them, would have no right at all. . . . The Powers accorded their goodwill to the birth of the new State, but not one was called upon to participate in my efforts; hence it follows that none has the right of intervention, which nothing could justify."

That was rather different from the message which the King of the Belgians sent to Manchester when he was posing as a philantropist eager to engage the sympathetic consideration of the British people. He said then—

> "that the State had been called into being for the purpose of promoting the civilisation and commerce of Africa, and for other humane and benevolent motives; . . . to enable commerce to follow the Association's advance into Central Africa," "to prevent the slave trade," to enable European traders "to fully enter into communication with the natives," "to civilise Africa by encouragement given to legitimate trade."

Not a single prophecy or promise of the King of the Belgians had been fulfilled so far as the Congo Free State was concerned. There was practically no international commerce. England made a separate agreement on behalf of herself and other nations that there should be international exchange and free commerce. A small portion of the Lower Congo was open. There were one Dutch firm and one British firm there, but in the whole of the vast territory to the north what had they got? It was a territory given up to rubber exploitation alone, and the rubber was not got by the payment of wages to the natives as was the case in every other portion of civilised and uncivilised Africa. In all the colonies of Africa, whether French, German, or British, there was not the same system of compelling natives through taxation only to develop the resources of the country. What had been the conditions of labour ever since the occupation began? Up to March of this year the natives spent 300 days in the year collecting rubber by force practically under the terrorism of sentries, the only people who represented in these districts the commerce of the places. They were compelled by these sentries to gather rubber for the greater part of their natural existence. The reform announced in the decree published by the King of the Belgians suggested that now, instead of being looked to to pay through taxation during those long days of labour, the natives should pay a tax varying from 4s. to 19s. a year. But supposing the great companies who were the concessionaires and the Congo Government were to say, "Yes, we will allow you a penny or a halfpenny a pound for all the rubber you collect," he thought that, instead of forty hours labour per month being required to pay the tax on the natives, the old, bad, wicked, and oppressive system would still continue. This decree regarded from the standpoint of past experience would prove, he believed, as all those who had studied the question believed, to be a sham and a fraud upon Europe—a fraud upon the nations that had trusted the King of the Belgians. The King of the Belgians disputed our right of practical interference. In another place the case was put very fairly before the people of this country by the late Secretary for Foreign Affairs and the present Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. They put forward what had been put forward before in this House —our absolute right to intervene in the interests of humanity and civilisation to compel the King of the Belgians to make real reforms. But how could we do it? He believed that the only way that it could be done was through the appointment of consuls and the formation of consular courts. Those consuls would have an international supervision over the affairs of the Congo. The King of the Belgians talked of the people of his State. Who were they? 15,000,000 of natives with black sentries over them, armed with rifles, to compel them to collect rubber, and the rest of the officials hired by the King of Belgium to carry out his orders and nothing else. His orders were that sufficient rubber was to be brought in to enable companies such as he could name, which on a capital of £40,000 could make in three years a profit of £680,000. Why, if those promised reforms in the matter of taxation were true reforms to be carried out, the King of Belgium and all his authorities in the Congo Free State would be likely to leave it, because it was only by securing the rubber by this oppressive system that their obligations could become continuously successful. The profits of those companies had only been got by forced labour, and he wanted to know if, under the new decrees, the promises formerly made, and broken, by the King of Belgium were to be carried out. This country had a right to intervene; and were we willing to trust the Sovereign of the Congo Free State to carry out just one of the clauses of the decree as to forced labour which was to be occasionally applied? Were the natives to be compelled to serve as day labourers for five years or else to serve for seven years in the Army? The position was one which ought to make Great Britain as a civilized nation which understood what colonising meant, pause. He would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Foreign Secretary, who, he knew, sympathised with the position taken up by the late Government, and by this House, if he really believed that it was wise to wait until those decrees were applied; and if so how long?

SIR EDWARD GREY said that that only applied to the question of approaching the other Powers. If he remembered aright the late Government did approach the other Powers but did not receive a reply that they were willing to make representations with us.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said that that answer had no direct relation to the answer to the replies made by the other Powers. If the right hon. Gentleman meant something else, would it not be that England would take action upon her own authority whether the other Powers would intervene or not? A statement to that effect would, he was sure, be welcomed by hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House who urged strongly on the right hon. Gentleman that England should take the lead in this matter. After all, the Congo Free State would never have become an entity but for the approval of the and temperate, but his phrases as to the the manifesto of King Leopold being a "fraud on the Powers" and the expression "with his tongue in his cheek," hardly partook of the character of moderation and temperance. He supposed it was of no consequence how Englishmen expressed their views towards a small country like Belgium. Bullying and bluff was the order of the day.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he especially exempted Belgium. He addressed himself to the Sovereign of the Congo Free State.

*MR. McKEAN failed to see how the hon. Gentleman had improved his position by that remark. He had said in this House that the manifesto was a fraud upon Europe. That manifesto came from the King of the Belgians, a king who was referred to in another place as a king beloved by his people. He was glad the hon. Gentleman had given himself away in the disgraceful language which he had used.

SIR GILBERT PARKER protested against his speech being described as disgraceful.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that the words "disgraceful language" were rather strong, and to be regretted, but he could not say that they were unparliamentary.

SIR GILBERT PARKER drew attention to the fact that he himself had been called to order for using the word "disgraceful."

*MR. McKEAN said he would now pass from the hon. Gentleman's language to his alleged facts and his assertions. He did not propose to follow him in the incoherent discourse which he had addressed to the Committee but would merely select one or two of his leading assertions and show how those assertions were negatived by the facts. He would then leave the Committee to come to their own conclusions as to the rest of the speech. The hon. Gentleman spoke of sentries armed with rifles. In the decree of reforms which the King of the Belgians had solemnly and publicly sanctioned was this heading to a paragraph, "The suspension of capetas and sentries armed with improved rifles."

SIR GILBERT PARKER: With improved rifles!

*MR. McKEAN said the rifles were taken away from the capetas and armed sentries. So much for the truth of one assertion. The speech of the hon. Gentleman was not of sufficient importance to go through *verbatim et seriatim.* The hon. Member had further told the Committee that the natives of the Congo Free State had to work 300 days out of the 365, but the fact was that the tax the native had to pay was a tax of forty hours a month, and those hours were paid for. The things of which they had been told could not be true without the Powers of Europe acting in the matter; the thing was preposterous, absurd and incredible. The hon. Gentleman's speech contained only one important issue, and he would deal with it in accordance with the facts. This matter could not, and would not, be decided by bounce and bluster. The issue was the right of intervention. He denied the existence of that right, and he did so on three grounds. He denied that it existed on grounds of natural right and justice. He denied its existence on the facts and on grounds of international law. And, finally, he denied that it existed on the great principle of the law of equity, which said that he who sought equity must do equity: in other words, he who came into a court of equity must come with clean hands. Let him deal with each of these grounds in turn. First, he had said that on grounds of natural law and justice the right of intervention did not exist. Why? King Leopold, in his dignified and noble letter of June 3rd last, sanctioning the decrees of the Commission of Reforms for the Congo, answered the question. He said—

> "The Congo has thus been and can only have been a personal work. Now, there can be no more legitimate right than the right of the author to his own work, the fruit of his own labour."

And again where he boldly asserted—

> "My rights on the Congo are indivisible. They are the result of my personal labour and expense."

Hon. Members laughed. They would see that the claim formulated in these words was substantiated by independent authority, which was quoted with commendation and approval in another place only a day ago. He referred to an article which appeared in the *Quarterly Review* for January last, entitled "The Congo Question." That article was written in a tone distinctly hostile to King Leopold and his rule in the Congo. The admissions in it were, therefore, the weightier and more valuable on that account. Let him read some of them to the Committee. On page 47 he found these words—

> "Stanley started for the Congo in 1879 at the head of a powerful expedition, mainly, if not entirely, paid for by King Leopold."

On page 50 he found this sentence—

> "The Congo Free State was left free for some years from international jealousies to develop its organisation at the cost of the King of the Belgians."

This, he might remark, was subsequent to the Brussels Conference of 1892. Further down on the same page was the following sentence—

> "The money, therefore, which had brought the Congo Free State into being and which maintained it thenceforward, came in the main from the private purse of the King of the Belgians; or, later, from such funds as the King could raise from the sale or granting of concessions or from the produce of the Royal domain."

On page 54 was the following sentence—

> "There was now nothing for it but to fight with the Arabs for the possession of the Congo Free State. So King Leopold had to spend vast sums in raising armies of trained negroes officered by Belgians, Swedes, and English; and to send them under the command of Captain (afterwards Baron) Dhanis to subdue the Arabs on the Upper Congo. The Arabs were wiped out in several campaigns, conducted with extraordinary bravery by the Belgians and their comrades."

Further down on the same page was the following sentence—

> "The financial condition of the Free State now became a matter of great urgency to King Leopold. Its mantenance cost many thousands of pounds annually; and its returns, chiefly in ivory, went but a small way to meet the expenditure."

The last quotation in this connection that he would make was the following from page 57—

> "When it is remembered that nearly the whole of the gigantic expenditure of the Congo Free State and other Belgian enterprises in Central and Eastern Africa from 1875 to 1894, and to a less degree down to the present day, has been defrayed by the private fortune of the King of the Belgians, it is doubtful whether, even with all the private fortune assigned to him in the popular estimation as the result of the exportation of rubber and ivory from the Congo Free State, he has been more than reimbursed for the money that he laid out with the view, not only of enriching Belgium, but also of creating a great civilised State in the heart of Central Africa."

That was from a hostile article by a hostile writer. He noticed that hon. Gentlemen opposite did not scoff so much now, and perhaps before he had finished they would be even less inclined to scoff. Now they came to the kernel of this matter. He would be glad to hear afterwards the scoffers who sat opposite. They evidently did not know much about the question, if they did they would laugh a good deal less. He thought he was addressing a serious assembly, but he found that it contained overgrown and antiquated schoolboys. Those who claimed the right of intervention were divided into two classes. First, there were those who based the right on the alleged fact that England was a party to the foundation of the Congo State, which State they maintained was the creation of the Berlin Conference and the Berlin Act of 1885. That contention he would show to be historically untrue. Those who made it only showed their ignorance of the facts. The Berlin Conference opened on November 15th, 1884. On April 22nd in the same year the United States of America had recognised the International Association of the Congo as "a properly constituted State." The next day France did the same. On November 8th, 1884, one week before the Conference met, Germany recognised the Association as "an independent and friendly State." On December 16th, 1884, Great Britain, and on the 19th of the same month Italy, recognised the new State as independent and sovereign. Therefore what existed before the Berlin Conference could not be the creation of that

Conference. Not only was it historically untrue, as he had shown, that the Congo State was the creation of the Berlin Conference, but the contention was contradicted in 1894 by Lord Kimberley, the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. In a despatch dated August 14th, 1894, Lord Kimberley wrote to the late Lord Dufferin, then English Ambassador in Paris, the following words—

> "The Congo State was not, at least to the knowledge of the British Government, constituted by a Conventional Act."

The other class of people who claimed the right of intervention were those who held that, though England was not a party to the foundation or creation of the Congo State, yet the said State was under treaty responsibilities to us, responsibilities derived from the Berlin Act, Clause VI, which provided, along with other matters of no importance for present purposes, that all the signatory Powers bound themselves to watch over the preservation of the native tribes and to have a care for their moral and material improvement. If that contention were well founded the Berlin Act was a treaty binding all the signatory Powers towards one another. But Mr. Root, Secretary of State for the United States, said in this connection—

> "It is questionable whether the treaty rights of the signatories extend to intervention by any one or more of them in the internal affairs"—

that was, the internal affairs of the Congo. But weighty as was the opinion of Mr. Root, he could prove their case without it. He could show that the right of intervention, based on Article VI. of the Berlin Act, was altogether without foundation. This was shown by what took place at the Brussels Conference of 1892. The Brussels Act of that year defined what was meant by the Berlin Act of 1885. At the Brussels Conference the following text was proposed for Article III—

> "The powers exercising a Sovereignty, a Protectorate, or an influence in Africa, confirming and giving precision to their anterior engagements bind themselves to pursue by the divers means indicated in Articles I. and II. the suppression of the slave trade."

And so on. He invited the particular attention of the Committee to what followed. M. Macedo, one of the Portuguese plenipotentiaries, proposed to suppress the words by which the Powers confirmed and gave precision to their anterior engagements. Another plenipotentiary, however, called attention to the fact that these words referred directly to Article VI. of the Berlin Act, and he declared that consequently they were not useless. He proposed, however, to replace the word "engagements" by the word "declaration" which more closely corresponded, he said, with the text of Article VI. The text in this amended form, with the word "declaration" substituted for the word "engagement," was adopted. What was the conclusion, the only conclusion, deducible from this fact? Obviously, that all the Powers represented at the Brussels Conference, and England amongst them. clearly defined, as he had related, Article VI. of the Berlin Act, not as an "engagement" binding all the signatories one to another, but as a "declaration" of principles binding each of them individually. When this matter came to be discussed, not amongst politicians with a smattering of knowledge upon the subject, but amongst right hon. Gentlemen like the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the importance of this would be at once realised. He supposed the Committee followed the distinction— a very important distinction. If the conclusion which he had drawn was not the correct one, then what would be the significance or force of the change of words? Clearly it would have no force nor meaning whatever, and they would have the spectacle of the delegates of the Great Powers, met in solemn conference, wasting their time in making useless verbal alterations in an historic treaty! What an impossible position! No; those who asked for intervention had not, to use a popular phrase, a leg to stand on—an assertion which was proved by the fact that hitherto they had made so little headway in their agitation so far as concerned the Foreign Powers who were signatories to the Berlin and Brussels Acts. The Government were simply making themselves ridiculous. Let him here interpolate a consideration which, though he did not make it a formal part of his argument, was not without force and substance. If we had a right of intervention in the Congo, *a fortiori* we had a right of intervention in Natal. Why two months ago did the Government refuse in the most explicit terms to exercise this undoubted right? Let the Committee hear what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said. Speaking on the 15th of March last he said—

> "I remember in my time at the Colonial Office I was asked to take the strongest possible measures by well-intentioned people who complained of the treatment of natives by West Australia. My own belief was then, and is now, that these statements of the ill-treatment of the natives were grossly exaggerated. But whether they were right or wrong, I refused to pay any attention to them beyond conveying the letters in which these accusations were made to the Governor of the Colony, leaving it to his discretion to communicate them to his Government, but making it perfectly clear that I had no claim whatever to interfere in what was a matter of local interest and local interest alone. I deny altogether that on any ground Imperial interest, as understood by any constitutional authority, we have or could have any right of interference in West Australia, or, again, in the case of the Transvaal."

He was glad to find that he had such weighty authority as the *Tribune* newspaper with regard to his third ground. When one went into a national court of equity it was necessary to have clean hands. Was there any country in the world which went into an international court of equity with such hands as England did? The *Tribune* newspaper on Tuesday last used these words—

> "There is an appreciable Party in the House" (referring, of coure, to this House) "which, in addressing itself to the methods of barbarism in the Congo, will be inclined to ask: 'Are our hands clean?'"

Common decency ought to prevent men in this House or outside of it, having regard to the facts of the situation in British Colonies, from getting up and making these appeals until they had set matters right in their own lands. A writer, who called himself an Englishman, said in the *Daily Mail* some ten days ago—

> "I am not going to say that England is not a robber. She is. She possesses a genius for robbery."

And this was the nation that sat in judgment on the conduct of other nations! No wonder they were called Pharisees and Philistines all over the civilised world. In listening to the speech of the hon. Member for Gravesend one would have thought that the British Colonies were little paradises, that their administrators were saints, and their institutions perfect. The hon. Member talked of the despotism of the autocrat. Speaking for himself he would say "Give me the autocracy and the despotism of King Leopold in Ireland a dozen times before your boasted constitutional Government." They talked of the depopulation of the Congo and of over-taxation. Were the Committee aware that a Commission of Inquiry appointed by the British Government found that this rich country was robbing Ireland, which was a poor country, of over £3,000,000 a year? And then hon. Gentlemen talked about over-taxation and forced labour in the Congo. What about the forced labour they had in Ireland? This country had sent her sentries to Ireland in the shape of landlords, and the poor people had to live on Indian meal three times a day in order to be able to pay rents to the landlords. It was not this Liberal Government, much as the Irish representatives respected it, that put an end, or attempted to put an end, to forced labour in Ireland. It was done by the Government that preceded this one. Depopulation! Where were the millions of Irish exiles who by evil laws had been driven from their own land? The hon. Member for Gravesend had talked of the private domain of the King of Belgium in the Congo. What about the private domain in India where the State owned three-fourths of the territory as a private domain? Every one of the blots in the Congo which had been painted in such lurid colours to-night were to be found existing in an intensified and aggravated form in British dependencies. They heard a great deal about atrocities in the Congo. Had there not been atrocities in Ireland too? Government officials in Ireland had committed outrages. They had houghed cattle, got up moonlighting raids, and sent threatening letters. Hon. Members had only to read the debates in this House to know the kind of things which had been done in Ireland. They could not be denied. These things had been done by the officials and the police, and the people knew the meaning of atrocities in Ireland. In the same way as the police in Ireland had manufactured outrages and got innocent men convicted and sent to prison, where one of them died, so the reports of atrocities in the Congo had been exaggerated. But there the converse proposition was true. Atrocities had been committed by cannibals, and then, forsooth, they were charged upon the administration, which was not like the British, a pattern administration. He would cite the authority of Mr. George Grey, brother of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in favour of what he was saying now. The statements of Mr. George Grey went to show that what had been said by the hon. Member for Gravesend was not true. Mr. Grey said in a letter addressed to the *Morning Post*—

> "In the part of the Congo where I lived, I saw nothing of the atrocities which certain English newspapers allege are a daily occurrence in that part of the world. On the contrary, my experience of the Congo administration is that it is composed of gentlemen who are characterised by humane and kindly feelings, and perform the duties entrusted to them with strict impartiality."

In a letter addressed to the *Morning Post* on January 20th, 1903, a Mr. Grey, who, he assumed, was the same Mr. Grey from whom he had already quoted, wrote—

> "That the natives of this country have never suffered ill-treatment from white men was evident to me from the time I entered the country."

And then he said—

> "When I first entered the Congo I found some armed natives who posed as soldiers of the Belgian Government, and who lived more or less the life of robbers, raiding and stealing wherever they went. The natives believed that these men were the authorised police of the European administration."

He would quote another letter published in the *Globe,* dated 28th December, 1905, addressed to the Government of the Congo Free State by Mr. Millman, the head of the Baptist Mission in part of the Congo region. He said—

> "It is a pleasure and an honour to be able to say that in this part of the province Orientale, that is in the country lying between Isanghi and Stanleyville, with which we are, and have been, for eight years very intimately acquainted, we have never see nor known of any case of grave maladministration or cruelty."

Again he said—

> "We have just completed our annual inspection of the native schools under our direction in over seventy villages, in which some 3,000 children are being taught to read and write, and we have found in all these places uniform tranquillity and comparative contentment."

He would only cite one other authority, Sir Harry Johnston, who said—

> "While at work in Uganda I had occasion to visit the adjoining regions of the Congo Free State along and across the Semliki River. In this portion of the Congo Forest I questioned many natives. From none of them did I receive the slightest complaint as regards the treatment they received from the Belgians, and indeed, the sight of their villages, plantations and settlements, and the fact that they so freely came and talked to the white men, were sufficient to show that they were perfectly content with their present lot. The Belgian and Swedish officers whom I met in this portion of the territory of the Congo Free State were men of the best character. In short, this portion of the Congo territory left little to be desired, and in some respects was better organised than the adjoining districts of the British Protectorate."

Further down he said—

> "There are no doubt bad Belgians as there have been bad, cruel, and wicked Englishmen and Scotchmen amongst African pioneers. In the early days of African enterprise I have seen too many misdeeds of my own countrymen in Africa to be very keen about denouncing other nations for similar faults."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) asked if the hon. Gentleman did not know that Sir Harry Johnston had taken the chair at a meeting which he had attended, and had endorsed the opinions of the mover of the Motion now before the Committee?

*MR. McKEAN said that if Sir Harry Johnston gave expression to one set of opinions at one time and another set of opinions at another time, the facts remaining the same, so much the worse for Sir Harry Johnston. The story of the atrocities and maladministration in the Congo Free State was one of the greatest myths of the nineteenth or twentieth century. He asked the Committee whether, in face of such testimonies, it considered that there were grounds for intervening in the affairs of the Congo? In connection with the testimony that he had adduced in favour of the existing régime in the Congo, there was another vitally important topic with which he should like to deal at length, but which, owing to the exigencies of time, he should have to deal with very briefly, and that was the evidence upon which this fabric of misrepresentation, not to use a stronger word, was based. He would give the Committee his own personal experience to begin with. He went to a meeting this year in the Caxton Hall, at which a resolution condemning the administration of the Congo was proposed and seconded. It was supported in a long speech by a missionary from South Africa, who dealt at great length with the question of atrocities. He told in great detail the story of one atrocity. Strange to say, he never mentioned such important facts as where the alleged atrocity occurred, when it occurred, by whom it was perpetrated, or who the victim of the atrocity was. The speaker, when questioned, said he was prepared to give him (the hon. Member) all the facts. He continued to speak on the topic, but still failed to give a single one of the particulars requested. He (Mr. McKean) again pressed him for the desired information. The gentleman then gave the name of the place where the incident occurred, and the name, so far as he could gather, of an official who was connected with the perpetration of the atrocity. Not wishing to interrupt the proceedings, he accepted for the time being this inadequate information. After the meeting was over the gentleman came to him and told him he would write him full particulars. After the lapse of some days he did write and send him a copy of a letter that he had sent to a Belgian official, but so far as he could gather the document had no reference whatsoever to the alleged atrocity. At a meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society held some six days afterwards he had a somewhat similar experience with the same reverend gentleman. That gentleman talked at large about atrocities. He manipulated his phrases in such a way that one would think he was relating personal experiences. To make sure, he questioned him on the point. He had to say that they were not personal experiences. He asked him from what source then did he obtain the accounts of these atrocities? He answered "From the Report of the Commission of Inquiry." A gentleman in the audience rose and said: "From the Report?" The missionary then said: "No, not from the Report, from the evidence given before the Commission," and upon further pressure he admitted that he had never witnessed during his whole time in the Congo a single atrocity. If time permitted, he (Mr. McKean) thought he could satisfy the Committee that all the witnesses on whose evidence these charges of atrocities and cruelties were based were in the same case. He would show that their evidence was utterly unreliable, and he asked whether in these circumstances it was wise on the part of hon. Gentlemen to engage in this campaign. Not only did they exaggerate and prevaricate, but they were frequently guilty of perversion of the facts and suppression of the truth. By no chance did they ever make an honest admission. Never did they pay the smallest tribute to the work done in the Congo. He wished he had time to read what the Report of the Commission of Inquiry said on this subject. He respectfully submitted that King Leopold's rule in the Congo justified its existence by two alone of its achievements—the abolition of slave raiding and the virtual prohibition of the trade in alcohol. He would not speak of the railways, telegraphs, steamboats, technical schools, and other evidences of civilisation that were found in the Congo. They might ask: How is it that nowhere else is there an agitation proceeding with regard to the administration of the Congo except in this country?" Were we the only humanitarians? Was not the absurdity of the position perfectly transparent? If these charges that were made against the Congo were true, why was it that the other Powers were so slow in supporting our demand for intervention? Let them suppose for a moment that things were not perfect in the Congo. Was there not a certain amount of indecency in this agitation, having regard to the facts with which he was going to deal? A Commission of Inquiry had been appointed and had reported, suggesting certain reforms, and these reforms had been sanctioned by the King. If hon. Gentlemen had waited, had given reasonable time for the reforms to be put in practice, if they had watched the operation of those reforms, and found that they had not achieved their object, they would have been in a more favourable position, as he thought, for continuing this campaign. Before concluding, let him say a word on the international aspect of the question. These attacks on the Congo and its Sovereign had excited feelings of deep resentment in the breasts of the Belgian people. Belgium, though small, was a wealthy State, and rich nations in times of difficulty could make their power felt in unexpected ways and places. Perhaps Belgium possessed more influence in some of the courts and some of the Chancelleries of Europe than we suspected. Then, let them ask their military experts as to the strategic value of Belgium in case of war with a certain other European Power. Was it wise, therefore, for hon. Gentlemen to be identifying themselves with a cause which, without their countenance, would speedily collapse, and which, if hon. Gentlemen only knew the facts, they would find to possess no humanitarian basis whatsoever? Would it not be wiser to give time for the reforms to be put into practice, thus maintaining our old traditional policy of friendliness towards Belgium, remembering that this country was largely instrumental in calling Belgium into existence as an independent State, and that at every critical period in the history of Belgium, England had been the defender and the protector of independence?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that only one day was allotted to the discussion of the Foreign Office Vote although this was a most important Vote, and upon it questions were raised in which many Members took very great interest. He was glad that the Committee was not forced to consider the problems of our relations with the great Powers of Europe, for these relations were delicate. By saying that he did not mean to suggest that there was any risk of war. Even the recent proposals of disarmament would be a risky subject to discuss in detail in the Committee. In order to save time he should avoid the many subjects in which he fully supported the Secretary of State, and deal only with those as to which he had questions or doubts, before he replied to the hon. Member for South Monaghan. He would point out that, perhaps through no fault of its own, the Foreign Office was at the present time more unpopular than it probably realised in a large portion of the King's dominions. Very severe attacks had been made upon the Foreign Office in the Commonwealth of Australia. That unpopularity was incurred on account of matters which touched other Colonies as well as Australia and New Zealand. Canada was upset on the question of the treaty-making power. In regard to the New Hebrides, a question of great difficulty and danger and one which concerned Australia deeply was dealt with by the Foreign Office in Paris without any previous consultation with the Colony. No doubt the feeling excited had been exaggerated, but he hoped the Foreign Minister would do something to allay the feeling which had arisen in regard to this matter. As to the question of the visit of the Fleet to Cronstadt, many Questions had been asked. He fully agreed with the Foreign Secretary in his desire that this country should be on the best of terms with Russia. The difficulty lay in the prevalence of religious persecution within that Empire. We had had the recent persecution of the Gregorian Church. Then there was the persecution of the Roman Catholics in Poland, and there was also the persecution of Jews in various parts of Russia. All these matters had been admitted by many persons in Russia including Prince Urusoff. In many cases it was also admitted that officials of the Government had assisted in the persecution. When the Fleet arrived in Russia, were there to be banquets and State receptions? If so, to whose honour and glory were they to redound? To what Party would the credit go? We could not tell, but we must take no steps that might be looked upon as expressing sympathy with any Party. Prince Urusoff, one of the leading members of the Duma, who was formally a Home Office official in Russia, said from his experience that the police had taken part in massacres. It was perfectly possible that within a day or two Prince Urusoff might become Home Minister for Russia. In circumstances of that kind it might no doubt do more harm than good to stop the visit of the Fleet. But might not the House of Commons ask that at all events there should be nothing in the shape of demonstration or fraternisation? We should not seem to take sides with any Party in Russia. Coming to the Congo, no one could wonder that we should have statements made about our hands not being clean in the face of the first telegram in regard to the Egyptian events that went round the world. The misfortune caused by a first telegram was very great indeed. The great impression produced throughout the world was the first impression. That was what had to be faced. No one would deny the fact that it had always been the desire of the Radicals of this country, whether they were sitting on one side of the House or the other, to hold the balance even between this country and others. If it was shewn that things were wrong they joined with hon. Gentlemen opposite and tried to set them right; they always worked together on matters of that kind. Although there were circumstances with regard to the Congo Free State which wer every different from anything that was alleged in the Egyptian case, yet there was this fact. This House desired to pursue a policy which would conciliate the Egyptians to our rule, if it were possible, and if our object was to strike terror, as it seemed to be from the terrible floggings of which they read, it was fatal to our Occupation, and we must give up the Occupation in Egypt altogether if it could not be maintained without such things as that. He thought enormous harm had been done by the telegram. The punishment of flogging when, even remotely, it appeared to be connected with political offences was one which did this country great and permanent harm abroad, where, in most countries, an entirely different view prevailed with regard to these matters from that which prevailed here. There was some reason for those remarks, because there had been such things denied at first, but afterwards admitted and were recorded. One terrible case was that of Afghanistan at Christmas, 1879–80; a case first denied, afterwards admitted, subsequently apologised for in this House, complete satisfaction being ultimately given. He would not pursue the subject now, as time was precious. All he asked the right hon. Gentleman to do in correcting that telegram was to make it clear to the country, and if possible to the world, that we repudiated the statement that we gloried in such horrors; and also that he should remember that the punishment of flogging in connection with any offence which could even appear to be a political offence did undying harm to the name of this country abroad. With reference to the remarks of the hon. Member for South Monaghan, he was glad to think we had now reached a time when Catholic opinion and Belgian Catholic opinion was on our side. This country was fond of Belgium, and had great sympathy for the Belgian people in this matter of the Congo Free State. He asserted most emphatically that there was no quarrel with Belgium. The quarrel was with the Sovereign of the Congo Free State as a distinct and separate entity from the King of the Belgians, and he was happy to say that after a long struggle Catholic opinion in Belgium was with us on this matter.

MR. MCKEAN: No, No!

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that was the case. The hon. Gentleman he was afraid had been trying to raise Catholic opinion in Belgium against us on this subject, as he had endeavoured to raise Irish opinion against us. There was one most gratifying illustration of the truth of what he said in the book written by Father Vermeersch, a Jesuit, which had been circulated, not by him, but by his brother Jesuits, a fact which showed that those gentlemen had come to the belief that the state of things in the Congo Free State was doing harm to the national name of Belgium and the Catholic cause throughout the world. It was from the point of view of the patriotic Belgian and the religious Catholic that Belgians had circulated the work of Father Vermeersch. The hon. Member in his speech referred to the *domaine de la Couronne.* In that domain there was not a single Roman Catholic missionary and not a single mission station of any kind. Therefore there was a territory, next to the territories of the great companies, where the worst abuses prevailed of any part of the State, with regard to which we might admit that the Catholic missionaries had not been able to help us because they were excluded from that country. He had stated that all the most authorised representatives of Belgian Catholic opinion had now come on to our side. He would make good that assertion. The newspaper in Belgium which had the largest sale, *Le Patriote,* was on the side of reform. The best Conservative paper, *Le 20ième Siècle,* and *Le Bien public de Gand,* which was the best-known ultramontane paper in Belgium, were on our side. The present attitude of the Catholic Church in Belgium was expressed by the episcopal organ when it said, in reference to the proceedings they had been pointing out, "This must cease." In the recent five days debate in the Belgian Chamber a number of Catholic organs were quoted as showing the change of opinion that had occurred. The *Mouvement des Missions Catholiques au Congo*, an official Bulletin, had declared that "We must submit to the evidence," and "not continue to compromise everywhere the Belgian name." That was exactly what they in this country said, and they were, he submitted, friends of Belgium and not its enemies in saying it. He believed they might now say that the whole of the Protestant missionaries—Swedish, Norwegian, American, Danish, German and British, and the Catholic missionaries stood upon the same side. The hon. Member for South Monaghan had denied altogether the right of this country to interfere, and that right had also been denied by one or two of his friends by interpellated questions during the last few weeks. The State was the absolute creation of Europe, and the right of the Powers collectively to interfere had never been denied by anybody except the King of the Belgians. As to the right of this country to interfere, Stanley, who had in this House described himself as the servant of the King of the Belgians, had declared that we had the strongest claim to intervention if we chose to intervene. The right of intervention seemed to him to be clear beyond all dispute. There were not wanting occasions on which we had interfered in affairs of State on behalf of humanity, where we were less entitled than in this case. But looking at the history of this transaction—which was told most admirably in another place a few days ago by the late Secretary of State and the present Under-Secretary of State, who agreed completely on every point—it was impossible to say we had not a national responsibility. The State was founded by the Anti-Slavery Society. It was created in the name of Almighty God for the protection of the natives of Africa, and as an example to all other people of how the natives of Africa should be treated. The hon. Member for Gravesend had alluded to the action of this House in the Congo State at various times. The first action was that taken by him, in which he was glad to say he had the support of the hon. Member for East Mayo, who would, no doubt, take the same line on this occasion as he did then, namely, that of condemning these horrors, but holding that we should first set our own house in order. In that he quite agreed, but we had a national responsibility in respect of this particular State. After that the missionaries were called in and an illusory Committee was appointed to blindfold the people. Then in 1903 there was the unanimous Resolution of this House in consequence of which King Leopold most unwillingly appointed the Commission of Inquiry. Next came the report of that Commission, which he withheld from publication until he was forced into publishing it. The evidence had never been published up to the present time. Then came the reference of that report to the Reforms Commission—a Commission which, though packed with creatures of the King, nevertheless reported dead against him. That report had not been published, though the President of the Commission pressed for its publication, and a Resolution was carried unanimously by the Belgian Chamber. In the preface to that Resolution it was stated that the Chamber expected that the report of the Reforms Commission would be published, which it had never been. It also expressed the conviction that the decrees based on that report would be satisfactory. Those decrees were drawn by the Commission of Reforms, and they were cut down and sent out to Governor-General Waihis who was responsible for all the horrors that had occurred. In their emasculated form the decrees were offered to us as though they were a sufficient satisfactory reply to all the demands. What was wanted above all was publicity. The five days debate in the Belgian Chamber eventuated in this resolution—

> "Seeing the conclusions of the Commission of inquiry . . . . expresses confidence in the Commission of Reforms and the consequent decrees . . . . and decides to proceed without delay with the Annexation Bill."

Both Parties in this House had accepted the policy of annexation of the State to Belgium because annexation to a free constitutional State like Belgium ought to bring Parliamentary responsibility and publicity. But, they had since seen the King's manifesto, which, flouting Europe in a way which Europe had seldom been flouted by any potentate, and maintaining principles which they thought were out of date and which were, at all events, singularly inconsistent with the original principles of the foundation of the State and with the original claims made by the king himself, hampered the whole of the future of the State and showed that the King did not desire, in spite of his Ministers, to hand over that State to his country in a free and above-board fashion. What had been done? This was a practical House, and desired to see practical steps taken. By these decrees as they now stood the domains were left alone. Some of the evidence was too horrible to publish, and witnesses were being punished; but feeling in this country had been too strongly excited to allow Mr. Stannard to die in gaol. He supported the hon. Member for Gravesend in the proposals he had made. Germany had not been very willing to act with us in the past, but always, he thought, for political reasons, having to do with the general state of Europe. On the particular case in question the German Chambers of Commerce and various conferences had more than once expressed concurrence in our view. Lord Fitzmaurice in a recent debate threw out a suggestion which was not reported, that the International Commission for the Congo Navigation could be set up by the Berlin Act.† The Foreign Office once threw some doubt upon the possibility of setting up that Commission and rather looked upon it as a temporary power which had lapsed. If the Foreign Office did express that view they were wrong. There was one possible means of action besides the revival of the Consular tribunals, the setting up of the Congo Navigation Commission, which he held could be done. To bring into force the navigation powers which could be maintained by such a Commission required only the signature of five of the signatory Powers. He admitted that we could not act in such a matter without Germany, but knowing the feeling of the German Chambers of Commerce on this question he believed it was not impossible to secure German co-operation, but it should not be overlooked that it was within the right of any five Powers to establish at once a Commission for the navigation of the Congo, supported by their own ships of war. What they asked was more light, and he believed the various suggestions thrown out would afford a leverage for getting it. It was light and publicity they were asking for and which he was convinced this country was still demanding.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I rise, not because I wish to reply now on the Congo debate, or on most of the points which have been raised. I realise that there are others who still wish to speak. But I rise to make a short statement, an appeal to the Committee on a subject which has been touched on. It is, if the Committee will only realise it, the most serious subject which has yet been touched upon this evening—the question of the present position in Egypt. The right hon. Baronet has spoken of the immense harm which has been done by the first impression given by the report of the way in which the sentences were carried out. I asked the House when the sentences were first announced to accept the statement which I made that the tribunal had been the highest possible, and that its character was such as to be a guarantee that the trial had been fair. But that was followed by an account of the way in which the sentences were carried out. Now, I am perfectly well aware of the effect and impression made by that account which appeared in the Press. It gave rise to two impressions certainly, I think, perhaps, three. One impression conveyed by that account was that, in executing the sentences, the men who were going to be hung were compelled to regard others being flogged, so that the last thing they saw was the sight of other men being flogged. The second impression was that the execution of the sentences had been deliberately protracted so that it lasted for a period of three hours. I am told that the third impression created was that the population was compelled to attend and witness the execution. When I read that account in the Press I made up my mind at once that with a short account like that the only fair and sensible thing to do was to say nothing, and as far as possible to do what is much harder, to think nothing till a full report of the whole circumstances had been received from our responsible representative in Egypt, and from those who were concerned in the case. I would ask the House still to wait for a full report—but I have enough information to dispose of all these three points. It is not the case that any single one of the condemned men witnessed the sentences being carried out on others; they were kept apart in separate tents so that that should not be done, and special pains were taken to prevent that. In the next place, the sentences were carried out with the greatest expedition possible in the circumstances of the case; it did not last for three hours, but the whole were executed in one hour. In the third place, no one not on duty was compelled to attend, and a cordon of police was formed to keep the population at a considerable distance. That disposes entirely of the painful impression produced on those three points by the first report that appeared in the newspapers. I would ask the Committee to believe that, when the Court had pronounced its sentence, and the sentences, I think, were to be carried out on the scene of the outrage, there fell to those on whom the duty rested of carrying out the decree of the court a serious and most painful duty, which had to be carried out under considerable difficulties. I must ask the Committee to believe, as I believe from the information I have now read, that that was carried out in a way which did not lay anyone concerned open to the charge of being callous. I ask the Committee to remember that I have promised full Papers on this subject. Short telegraphic reports are always liable to error. I would ask the Committee to remember that, in a matter of this importance, to embark upon a discussion before you have a full report of the circumstances, is certain to lead to things being said which, when you get the full facts, you will realise have not been fair to those who have been concerned. Already some unfairness has been done by the way in which Captain Machell's name has been brought into the matter, which I have done my best to repair by a reply I have made this afternoon as to Captain Machell's character. Surely it has been recognised for some time that of all the English officials employed in the service of the Empire, there are none of higher standing than there are in Egypt, owing to the great capacity that has been shown by Lord Cromer, and his great care in selecting men of ability, character, and fairness. Therefore, on the ground simply of mere fairness, I would ask the Committee not to embark on a debate on this until they have more Papers. But this is not the most serious ground. All this year a fanatical feeling in Egypt has been on the increase. It has not been confined to Egypt, it has been stretching along the north of Africa generally. It was for that reason a little time ago that the garrison had to be increased, and the despatch of British officers which happened recently is something which would never have occurred a little time ago, and would not have occurred to-day but for the fanatical feeling which has arisen in Egypt and spread during this year. Since that attack took place, and even before the trial of those who had been condemned for the attack, one or two disagreeable and significant attacks had been made, I think, upon British individuals, or at all events, Europeans, by natives. We may be on the eve of further measures necessary to protect Europeans in Egypt; and if the House of Commons questions the decision of a tribunal composed of the highest English Judges and the highest Egyptian Judges, it is bound to have the effect of weakening the authority of the Egyptian Government. As things are now I say deliberately, with a full sense of responsibility, if the House of Commons does anything at this moment to weaken or destroy the authority of the Government as it exists in Egypt, they will be face to face with a very serious situation, because if the fanatical feeling in Egypt gets the better of the constituted authority of the Egyptian Government you are then face to face with the use of force. The work which has been done by Lord Cromer in the last generation has been widely recognised. The condition in Egypt to-day is very different from what it was twenty-five years ago—I doubt whether in any generation you will find the lot of the common people has improved so much as that of the Egyptian people has, compared with the original state they were in before we were there. I know very well the House is not going to allow, whatever happens in Egypt, that work to be swept away by a rush of fanatical passion. I know that that is so. I promise to lay full Papers on this question, not because I doubt the fairness of the trial, or of anything that has happened, but because, when a wrong impression has once got afoot, as the right hon. Baronet said, how difficult it is to overtake it. The only chance of overtaking and removing it is to publish the fullest possible information. Therefore I shall publish it, not because I doubt, or because I think the House doubts, but because I wish to overtake and remove that wrong impression. As I say, I know the House is determined not to allow the work we have done in Egypt to be undone; but if they say or do anything in debate now to weaken the authority of the Egyptian Government, they may find themselves at any moment forced to take other measures, unconstitutional measures, measures which they are bound to take in an emergency, which no one would regret more than the present Government, and no one more than the present House of Commons, though they might be compelled to do so.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1580.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.) said that with reference to the executions in Egypt he would say nothing after the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman, except to express, he thought, on behalf of the whole House the satisfaction with which they heard the statement he had made, and the desire they all had to do everything in their power to avoid giving the impression of wishing to criticise in any way the conduct of the Egyptian administration. The right hon. Gentleman had called for a report both upon the procedure in court and upon the manner in which the sentences were carried out; and, until the report was received, it would obviously be unfair that they should pass any judgment upon the transaction. So far as he was concerned, and he believed he might also speak for the Party with which he was associated, he saw no advantage, on the facts as stated, in carrying the matter further. The House of Commons had in the past never claimed a general right of intervention in the ordinary administration of affairs in Egypt, most of the responsibility for which must rest on the Khedive and his officers, and the right hon. Gentleman who had control in this country, which was fortunate in possessing as its representative in Egypt one who had earned in the course of many years administration the confidence and respect of all classes of the community. He believed they might have every confidence in entrusting matters of this kind to the judgment and discretion of the right hon. Gentleman and Lord Cromer. It was not necessary to ask the right hon. Gentleman to give any fresh assurances as to the policy of the Government on the wider issues of foreign policy. The declarations of the right hon. Gentleman before he assumed office and the policy he had pursued since gave them every confiednce that the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and the maintenance of close and cordial relations with our neighbours across the Channel were regarded by the present Government as the twin pivots on which the foreign policy of this country rested. Both of them were founded on the natural community of interests, and neither of them prejudiced in the slightest degree our friendly relations with any other power. On the contrary it might be said to be one of the greatest arguments against a policy of isolation, which he thought this country had now definitely abandoned, that inevitably there should be a suspicion in the minds of foreign countries that a nation which had no settled affections could hardly have a settled policy. He passed, therefore, to the subject which had been alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean which would perhaps be further alluded to in the course of the debate. He meant the question of the treatment of the Jews in Russia. That subject had been dealt with in terms of strong indignation. Indignation could not be expressed too strongly; but he thought that very careful consideration was required before such a course as that suggested by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean was adopted by the Government. The right hon. Baronet had said very truly that we had to carefully abstain from taking any side.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: Or seeming to take a side.

Earl PERCY: Or seeming to take a side in the internal policy of Russia. He was not quite sure that the course which the hon. Baronet recommended might not have exactly that effect. We had no right to suppose that either the Government of Russia or public opinion in Russia was less alive than we were to the infamy attaching to these repeated outrages upon an inoffensive and defenceless population; and he thought they must recognise quite as clearly as we did the disastrous effect which a repetition of them might have on the relations between the two countries, which all desired should be placed on a more friendly basis. When minorities in any country were exposed to persecution of this kind it was commonly charged against them, either in good or bad faith, that they were actuated by motives of disloyalty to the Government under which they lived; and he was afraid nothing would be more likely to lend colour to that than criticism or intervention on the part of foreign countries. He thought that if this country was to render real assistance to the Jews that assistance might take a different form. The emigration of Jews from Russia, if this persecution were continued, would probably reach an unprecedented scale and might give rise to appeals to facilitate the acquisition of temporary settlements for the refugees. One scheme had already been under the consideration of the Foreign Office and the Colonial Office in regard to the acquiring of territory in Africa. Although that had been abandoned, other schemes might very likely be brought forward, and if that was the case he should like to offer for his own part an expression of his wish that His Majesty's Government and other Governments would bring to the consideration of any such schemes an earnest desire to do something more than offer platonic sympathy to the Jewish people, who had quite as much title to the sympathy of the Powers as many of those other races on whose behalf the good offices of Europe had been so often invoked and secured in the past. He wished to touch on the question of the 3 per cent. increase in the Turkish Customs duties in connection with Macedonia. The debate which took place two days ago in another place had left him in some doubt as to what the present state of affairs was. He understood that His Majesty's Government in common with the other Powers presented to Turkey a Note in which they signified their readiness to assent to an increase in the Customs duties on condition that certain stipulations were carried out. He understood also that the Turkish Government made a reply, in the course of which they raised so many objections and difficulties that the negotiations had practically come to a stand. He did not understand that the negotiations had been finally dropped or that the Government had dissociated themselves from the action of the other Powers. As they were at present in the dark as to the particular point on which the negotiations had broken down, it was very difficult to form any opinion as to the chances of their eventually reaching a satisfactory termination. He believed the Turkish Government had signified assent to the demands already made in regard to the reform of the Turkish regulations affecting British trade. He concluded, therefore, that the difficulties raised had reference to the demand that the collection of the proceeds of the new duties should be entrusted to the Commission of the Ottoman Debt, or else to the stipulation that was made, that the 3 per cent. increase should be limited to a period of seven years. He entirely agreed with the statement the Government had made in another place, that those demands formed the irreducible minimum which we could accept. He did not believe that public opinion in this country would agree to an appreciable extra burden on British trade, unless we had some guarantee that the money would be properly spent, that the promises of the Turkish Government would be carried out, that the financial equilibrium in Macedonia should be restored, which we might hope would take place within seven years, and that British trade would not be put in the position of having to go on contributing money for purposes of expenditure, or the financing of schemes for railways, or other purposes, from which British trade would derive possibly no benefit, or a very indirect benefit, and over which we should have no control, or no adequate control. But the breakdown of these negotiations with regard to the 3 per cent. increase might be regarded from two points of view — from the purely British point of view, or from the point of view of the European Powers. He thought the failure of those negotiations might be regarded, he would not say merely with equanimity, but with positive satisfaction, so far as we were concerned, for we should no longer be under the obligation to consent to further burdens on British trade, and so far as other Powers were concerned, they would not be in the position of having to surrender a lever in regard to finance which might perhaps be of great advantage to them in future negotiations with Turkey. But from the point of view of the Tukish Government the breakdown of the negotiations was little short of disastrous. Without fresh revenue neither the financial commission nor the *gendarmerie* could carry their work to a successful conclusion, and it was obvious that the Powers could not with any regard for their self-respect allow the commission to become a nonentity. Therefore, in some way or other the requisite money must be found, and it could not be found from increased taxation within the Ottoman Empire. It amounted already to 12s. per head per annum, and it would be universally recognised that no administrative reform would compensate them for an increase in the burden they now bore. It had been suggested that, as an alternative to the increase of the Customs duties, the Powers might consider the policy of guaranteeing a joint loan to Turkey. In the first place, he did not suppose the Government desired to encourage Turkey in the policy of borrowing, least of all for purposes which should be met out of current revenue; and, secondly, a loan would not be compatible with the existence of such a condition as the seven years' limit without which there would be no effective guarantee for the proper use of the money. Only two practical solutions remained. Either the Powers would have to insist upon the thorough re-organisation of the whole financial system of Turkey, a proposal which would involve an interference with the prerogatives of Turkey greater than had yet been suggested, or else they would have to insist upon a reduction of the vast military expenditure which was largely responsible for the present deficit, but a reduction which the Powers would not be justified in insisting upon unless they also insisted upon a corresponding reduction in the military armaments of the surrounding Powers, or were willing to give a collective guarantee of the territorial integrity of the Turkish Empire. The adoption of either of these courses would raise issues of great magnitude which the acceptance of the financial commission had laid in abeyance. He believed that the financial commission, if properly supported by the Powers, was capable of effecting very material improvements in every branch of Turkish administration. He frankly recognised that if Turkey persisted in its present attitude, a new chapter would be forced upon the Powers. He, therefore, hoped that the Turkish Government would think twice before they rejected conditions which were neither onerous nor disadvantageous to them, and the refusal of which could only be interpreted as motived by a desire on their part to reduce the financial commission to impotence. As to the question of the Congo, it was quite true that it was not from the Berlin Act that the sovereignty of the Congo State was derived, and that that Act did not provide any machinery for enforcing the obligations which were undertaken by its signatories.

But, as the assent of the Powers to the recognition of the Congo as a State possessing a national existence was given on the express understanding that certain definite principles of administration would be recognised by its Government, it was idle to contend that the Powers had not the right, collectively or individually, to reconsider their position if effect were not given to those principles. He should say further, that, apart altogether from treaty obligations, every State interested in any portion of the territory of the Congo comprised in the Convention had not only the right, but was under the obligation, from the point of view of self-interest, to consider how far the present system of misgovernment carried with it a serious menace to the reputation and even to the security of the European Government. He thought that if any criticism was possible on the action of the late or the present Government in regard to the Congo it was that they had been over-patient. His Majesty's Government would find it difficult, if not impossible, to defend the attitude of mere passive remonstrance if the only result of their forbearance was that the situation altered—as it undoubtedly had altered since the report of the first Commission —steadily for the worse. In regard to the report of the first Commission he had no desire to question its general fairness and impartiality. So far from seeking to palliate the infractions of the law and the abuses which had taken place, he thought the report might be taken as a general condemnation of the whole system under which the administration of those territories had been carried on, and was an emphatic endorsement of the accusations that had been brought against the Congo Government. What we were principally concerned with was not the verdict of that Commission on what had passed, but their recommendations regarding the future, and the practical steps that were to be taken to give effect to those recommendations. In the circumstances, one would have thought that the Congo Government would have been the first to recognise the need of some immediate action. It was said in their defence that some of the reforms proposed by the first Commission required elaboration in detail by persons possessed of some actual experience in administration. Even on that assumption, the composition of the second Commission was open to very serious criticism. From that Commission every representative not only of Protestant, but of Catholic missions, was excluded, and it contained actually seven members of the very Administration whose conduct had been so severely condemned. He was not disposed himself to admit that some of the most important reforms advocated by the first Commission ought not to have been immediately put into force without further investigation. Why should not the forty hours minimum of labour have been enforced; why should not fresh lists of contributors have been drawn up with a view to a more equal distribution of taxation; why should not stringent interim orders have been issued forbidding the employment of armed forces in connexion with the taxes; why should not a beginning have been made with carrying out the recommendations of the first Commission with regard to the judicial administration of the Congo? The extraordinary decision not to publish the findings contained in the report of the second Commission was exceedingly regrettable. The decrees were for the most part a mere reaffirmation of general laws and regulations which had been for a long time in existence, but which had not been enforced. As to the suggestion that the doubling of the number of officers which was necessary to secure the adequate control of the public forces, and that the general reorganisation of the administration must be postponed and could not be taken in hand without a further increase of revenue, he observed that the ruler of the Congo State had been able to devote a large part of the proceeds of that State to magnificent public buildings in Europe. Yet we were to wait for an increase in the revenues before the Congo State carried out its elementary obligation, but for which it would never have obtained international recognition. The one solitary measure on which we were asked to pin our confidence was the appointment of three inspectors to look after the interests of the natives in an area of something like a million square miles.

In one respect he discerned in the Report of the second Commission a slight advance on the Report of the first. They recommended that in future the right of levying taxation should be entrusted to special agents who were to act under the District Commissioners. If that recommendation meant that the agents were in future to have no connection with trade, and if it were adopted, it might mark a certain improvement. In view of the statement which had been made that the taxpayer had no right to claim the countervail of the tax which he paid, and the fact that there were no means of ascertaining how a great portion of the revenues derived from the Congo State—either the *domaine de la Couronne* or the *domaine privé*—were actually spent, one could not wonder that people should assert that no substantial amelioration of the state of affairs in the Congo could be expected without that provision for full and constant publicity and searching supervision which would be obtained by the establishment by Belguim of Parliamentary control over these territories. That brought him to the concluding remarks he had to make. An answer was given by the Foreign Secretary the other day to the effect that the Government did not propose to renew their representations on this subject in view of the fact that the Congo Free State recognised its obligations under Article 5 of the Berlin Treaty, and time should, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, be given to see the result of the action taken under the present decree. He thought the wording of that answer was unfortunate. There were two Articles of the Berlin Act which had a bearing upon this matter—Article 5 and Article 6. Article 5 referred to free trade in the Congo Basin, and the Congo authorities had always placed a different interpretation to that which we placed on those words. We had invited not merely the Congo Free State, but also France and the other Powers interested to submit the whole question of the interpretation of this free trade clause of the Berlin Act to the decision of some impartial tribunal. A short time ago the French Government seemed not unwilling to consider the invitation favourably, and he earnestly hoped, in view of the dissatisfaction which existed, and the necessity of clearing up questions of this kind in order to avoid all chance of friction with any Power in the future, the right hon. Gentleman would do his best to bring the Powers into line with us in that connection. Article 6 referred to the protection of the natives. And every man of the House except one agreed that the decrees which had been announced were hopelessly inadequate to secure a radical and real reform even if they were carried out in the Congo Free State territory, which was very doubtful. Yet we were going to imply by deferring representations on this subject, until it was seen whether these reforms were satisfactory, that we had some hope of a satisfactory result coming from these reforms. He had no such hope, and if he did not press the Government to-night it was because he was conversant with this question, having had to study it when he was a member of the late Government, and because he knew all the difficulties. In this matter we had no quarrel with Belgium. In the debate no one had uttered a word of criticism of Belgium or the Belgian people. There was ample evidence that the Belgian people were quite alive to the extreme gravity of the situation. Than England there was no country in Europe which, in view of its treaty obligations, had a greater interest in the strength and prestige of Belgium, and no one would rejoice more heartily than ourselves if, under Belgian auspices, under the contro of the Belgian Parliament, the Congo Free State were made in reality what its authors aspired it should be, a standing monument not only to the colonising genius but to the humanity, aims, and principles of the Belgian people.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said he did not propose to continue the discussion on the Congo Free State. After all, what he saw going on there was but a continuation of what had taken place in all countries civilised and uncivilised in the past—the rich and strong oppressing and robbing the weak and unfortunate. He rose to refer again to the contemplated visit of the British Fleet to Russia. In Russia at the present time was being waged one of those great constitutional struggles which divided a nation into two parts. On the one side was practically the entire nation—the peasants, the workmen, the great intellectuals of the universities, and the business men—demanding the sight of self-government; on the other, the Czar and the small ruling class which desired to perpetuate autocratic government. Under these circumstances, if the British Fleet went to Russian waters, who would be honoured by the visit, and what interpretation would be placed on the visit by the people as a whole? Some further light had been thrown on the situation by the telegrams which appeared in this morning's papers. In a letter to the *Tribune*, one of the Leaders of the Liberal Party in Russia expressed the opinion that if this visit took place it would be looked upon by the people of Russia as a siding on the part of this country with those who were opposing the reform movement. Surely it would be a mistake for the Fleet of Great Britain to visit the Government of a nation when that Government was in open conflict with the entire nation. Only the other day they were told that the explanation of the mutiny of the Marines at Cronstadt was the fear that the British warships which were coming to Cronstadt would fire on them as supposed mutineers. An overwhelming majority of the Liberal Party were against this visit as was a very fair percentage of the Unionist Party. Under all these circumstances was the Government justified in taking the risk of appearing to oppress the people of Russia? If the Fleet went to Cronstadt it would not go to the people of Russia, but to the Russian Government. It would not go with the goodwill of the people of this country, but on the responsibility of the Government itself. If festivities were held, there was strong probability that they would result in conflict between our Marines and the Russian Marines. Undoubtedly from every consideration that could appeal to the Government it was to be hoped that even now the Foreign Office would so recast its plans as to take the visit of our fleet to Cronstadt out of the area of the possible. The persecution of the Jews was but one phase of the struggle for reform. Every prison in Russia was filled to overflowing with political prisoners. The road to Siberia was black with the long dark lines of men and women who had been sent to exile because they were asking to be treated like human beings, and he for one protested against this country in any shape appearing to side with a system of government which made that state of affairs possible. He hoped therefore they would have some assurance in the matter.

*MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel) desired to enter a protest against our fleet being sent to pay a visit to Russia. Such a visit was always regarded as a compliment to the country to which it was sent, and if the British Government sent the Fleet at this time to a Russian port it would be practically an insult to the people of this country. It had been proved that the present Russian Government not only connived at but was implicated in the massacres at Byelostok and elsewhere. Were we to hold out our hands in friendship to hands that were imbued with the blood of innocent women and children? The accounts of the massacres at Byelostok which had reached this country from authentic sources were really too horrible for words. He would content himself with reading to the Committee an extract from a Russian newspaper in connection with the murders at Byelostok, describing the funerals of the Jews who had been murdered—

> "But the most striking scenes were observed near a stretcher which stood apart from the others, in which were lying two little corpses—brother and sister. Their bodies were covered up but their heads were visible. The brother, two years of age, had his back ripped up with an axe, and the sister, only ten months old, had been strangled. Both appeared as if calmly asleep lying clasped in each others arms and representing the most touching and peaceful picture of two little children wrapped in slumber. Their mother had also been killed. The persons surrounding this stretcher are not the relations of the children, but nevertheless the despair is indescribable and all the men, women, and children round about are weeping bitterly, and their groans and cries seem to say Why all this? and to raise a reproach to the Heavens."

That was a quotation from a Russian paper, and the fact that it had been allowed to appear in Russia showed that it was founded on fact. This country very properly refused to recognise the murderers of the King and Queen of Servia, but he submitted that the life of the meanest person in a country should be protected by the Government of that country. There was no difference between the life of a sovereign and the life of a subject so long as the individual was wronged. And therefore to send the Fleet at the present time to fête this Government—which, contrary to what had been said by the noble Lord opposite, had been conclusively shown to be implicated in these murders—at a time when the Jews were being murdered in Russia would be a great mistake. Time was when this country was the great champion of liberty, and he believed it to be still. In the American House of Representatives a vote had been unanimously passed in both Houses condemming the outrages on the Jews in Russia. He did not object to the rivalry, but would be very sorry to find that this country had been deposed by the United States as the champion of oppressed peoples and of liberty. He trusted therefore that the Government would take note of the proceedings in the American Houses of Parliament, and that even at this stage they would still decide not to send the Fleet to Cronstadt. In any case, as a member of the Jewish faith, he must raise his protest against this country having any dealings with those who had been guilty of the crimes he had referred to.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) said the debate had ranged over a variety of subjects, which must be the reason for all reference to the present state of affairs in China having so far been omitted, but which might, he feared, before long require the vigilant attention of the Government. But before alluding in detail to that subject, he desired to ask the Secretary of State whether he was aware that the Sultan of Brunei had recently died, and if so, whether the Foreign Office had it in contemplation to incorporate the Brunei territories with the domain of the Rajah of Sarawak. The Regent of Brunei, commonly known as the Bandara, as well as all those who had qualification and authority to speak on the matter, had strongly declared their anxiety in writing to have that fusion brought about without any further loss of time. He felt convinced that in view of the humane and enlightened administration of the Rajah, the Foreign Office would give this matter their earliest consideration. He now came to the cautious and circumspect allusion of the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean to the contemplated despatch of the British Squadron to Russian waters. We could put out of sight the existence of a dark and menacing spot in a not inconsiderable portion of Europe, where the pinions of liberty and ordered government were groping, struggling, toiling towards an issue, and he therefore was heartily in agreement with the right hon. Baronet that any action on our part which might even remotely be interpreted as a condonation of those hideous excesses and barbarities which had been amply brought home to the disgrace of Russian authorities, or as countenancing the taking of sides between those who were engaged in the epoch-making conflict between the bureaucracy and the Duma, would mean a deplorable set back towards reaching that issue. Looking further east, we saw the successful emergence from the straits and narrowness of an ancient and mediæval feudalism. Japan had been spontaneously accorded a front rank among the nations of the globe. But the newly extended alliance with this country was eminently calculated to maintain order and stability in the Far East, to conduce to civilised progress in those regions, and, above all, to give effect to the universal cry of "hands off" to a Power with a stormy petrel at its head, who had been only too conspicuous in fermenting discord among the comity of nations. But eirenicon with Japan was apparently not devoid of the something bitter, not exempt from some sources of friction and anxiety; because her great neighbour China, without the homogeneity, the cohesion, or any of the attributes of a civilised scheme of government, was endeavouring to acquire immunity from all liability to the trammels of international control. China had shown signs in many directions, and in divers ways, that she was chafing under that tutelage. Her government was trying to nullify the treaty governing the conduct of the maritime customs, and to usurp the functions and jurisdiction of the consular body in respect of the administration of the Mixed Court. In order to vindicate its aspirations, the oligarchy should prove its capacity to govern as well as to reign, the central government should be able to show that it could make its fiat obeyed throughout the length and breadth of the land, and that it possessed the first elements for the dispensing of strictly impartial justice, for the administering of a just and a humane code of laws. He asked the Committee whether these conditions were at all within a measurable distance of being fulfilled. The desire to achieve and to imitate a conquest by Japan of freedom from foreign control, to promote a policy of exclusion and extrusion embodied in the phrase of "China for the Chinese," from all the available data at our disposal seemed to be based upon nothing more tangible than the vague and nebulous view of being altogether rid of the foreign barbarian, without the remotest notion of what might happen to the considerable foreign interests and to the numerically not negligible foreign subjects, who were there pursuing their normal legitimate avocations secured to them under the aegis of treaties, some of them concluded two centuries ago and under the Pax Britannica as represented by the wholesome presence of the British Navy in the far Eastern mains. This consideration, though important, was not the only one. Had any human being any conception of what would befall the Chinese themselves, clustered in their millions under the patriarchal and more or less benevolent despotism of provincial viceroys, whose allegiance to the emperor and empress, or whichever was the power behind the throne, was of the slenderest character, who had been encouraged to organise Army levies for the purpose of maintaining order which the Government themselves, in acts of public spirit, seemed unable to see done themselves, and to whom the bare inkling of foreign withdrawal would be a trumpet call for internecine warfare or struggle for mastery? Did any one doubt that such an occurrence, with its sanguinary trail, would spell disaster, woe and red ruin, to the industrious millions who inhabited that vast geographical and heterogeneous entity known as the Chinese Empire? Fortunately, the Powers were united in their resolve to resist any encroachments upon formally, solemnly, and deliberately concluded treaties. The consuls were, he believed, keenly alive to the latent and inchoate, if they liked, but yet serious unrest and disaffection which was sedulously and clandestinely being fanned by some of the advanced Chinese politicians. He would address a respectful warning to the right hon. Gentleman not to permit any repudiation of the legally acquired rights of British subjects. If immunity was vouchsafed in one case, it would assuredly lead to fresh violations. Some weeks ago he brought to the notice of the right hon. Gentleman a case which he felt sure, the Committee would agree was an exceptionally flagrant instance of this new spirit that was abroad. He was loth to weary the Committee, and so proposed cursorily to run over the salient features of the Anhui Mining Contract. The preliminary agreement was signed in May, 1902, by the order of the Governor of Anhui, an important district on the Yangtze, and a British syndicate. The final contract was concluded with all the formal, prescribed formalities known to diplomatic usage at the Chinese Foreign Office, in June, 1903, with the full concurrence of our Minister. Mr. Wilkinson, the Legation Secretary, was instructed to be present. Thereupon the sinking of shafts and blasting operations were commenced at considerable expense, in order to determine the value of the mineral deposits. In June, 1905, the engineering and mining staff were sent down, only to be told, without rhyme or reason, that permission could not be granted. That was a deliberate attempt to render nugatory a concession of which His Majesty's Government had, over and over again, recognised the validity, because the required conditions, and to this he gathered the right hon. Gentleman assented, had been scrupulously observed. Thirteen months had since elapsed, and the demand of our Minister for a recognition of title had been treated with contemptuous procrastination. The natives of Anhui were only too anxious for the granting of the permission, so that they might earn their wages by the emploment which the mine owners were desirous of offering. The Secretary of State had exhausted all methods of persuasion; all conciliatory devices having so signally failed of their effect, the question arose should the Government, would it be wise, for them to acquiesce in such cavalier treatment? The right hon. Gentleman realised, and no one better, the mischievous character of the precedent that would be set were such unquestioned claims allowed to be disregarded and the Mackay Treaty, one of the essential stipulations of which contemplated the sanctity of these rights to be unceremoniously torn up and treated as so much waste paper, forsooth, because it did not accord either with the wish or the convenience of the Chinese Government to adhere to them. He might mention that he had no direct or indirect personal interest in this particular matter. But the view of those on the spot, who were best qualified to form a judgment, was that such claims, when recognised by our Government, should be resolutely urged and as promptly enforced. In the case of another Oriental recalcitrant Power nearer East, the Committee would recall to mind the incident of the seizure of a German vessel by the authorities in Constantinople; the German Ambassador, without wasting precious time on circumlocutory correspondence, boarded the vessel himself and hoisted the national flag, and the trick was done. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that it would be rendering a service to the Chinese Government were he to adopt a more vigorous course of action. In that case the Government would turn to the provincial governor and say, "This is a case of *force majeure*, resistance is futile," and so the Chinese face would be saved. Was there anything unreasonable in that suggestion? The right hon. Gentleman opposite, who knew China well, could assure the Committee how vital, and what vital assets were prestige and influence in Oriental countries, and how disastrous it would be for our Foreign Office to brook an act of injustice on so shallow and untenable a plea as the refractory attitude of a country governor. Let the Committee suppose that our own Government, or any other civilised nation, were to be guilty of a similar injustice; they could be taken before the impartial tribunals of the land, they could, to use the expressive language of recent education debates, be mandamused, or reparation could be obtained by the salutory provisions of a Defaulting Authorities Bill. What recourse had our subjects in China? What could they do to exact redress if the arm of British might and majesty confessed its powerlessness? A more contumacious act on the part of China had hardly yet been recorded. He shrewdly suspected that her statesmen, who were acute philosophers, had been speculating on the efficacy of those doctrines of non-intervention and turning the cheek to the smiter, which had been so abundantly preached and so insistently advocated by many supporters of the right hon. Gentleman. He respectfully pointed out that by tamely submitting to a bare-faced act of spoliation, which he felt convinced neither the United States nor Germany would tolerate, the right hon. Gentleman would be laying up a store of trouble and harassment to the Government and the nation, such as in former years and so unexpectedly led to the China war. He earnestly implored him not to allow our far-reaching influence and preponderance to became a byword and a reproach, that the influence and power, by means of which, and of which alone our subjects' rights might be upheld, and the predominant commercial position of Great Britain in the China Seas might remain properly safeguarded and unimpaired.

*MR. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock) said the subject of the Congo State was one upon which he felt as deeply as upon any topic which had been discussed in this House. It was, of course, quite impossible within the time available in the present debate to attempt to bring forward in any detail the evidence upon which they relied in their case against the Congo State. Every fair-minded man who had gone into the question must be aware of the infamous misgovernment of that region and the widespread pillage, torture, outrage and murder which prevailed. The evidence irresistibly proved their case against the Congo State up to the hilt. He was astonished that the only opposition to bringing about a better state of things in the Congo State should come from the Irish Benches. He could only say that the perusal of the evidence left him more thoroughly convinced of the justice of their case than ever. An apology for King Leopold's Government written by a gentleman with an Irish name and a Belgian decoration, recently sent broadcast to Members of this House, relied very largely on its description of various external signs of prosperity in the Congo regions. Photographs of the "before and after" type were displayed—a war canoe on one page and opposite to it a stern wheel steamer—large public buildings, steel bridges and so on. Some photographs which this precious pamphlet did not exhibit were those of hostage bands, of ruined villages, of the mulilated bodies of men, women and children whose sole offence was their failure to bring in enough rubber. The reasoning was based on that fallacy too common in modern times—the fallacy that the prosperity of a comparatively small section of the community was a reliable indication of the general happiness. It had, for example, been argued in this House and elsewhere that the securing of large dividends from the mines of the Rand was a proof of the prosperity of the Transvaal. But what thoughtful man believed that the general sum of human happiness in the Transvaal and South Africa was not infinitely greater before the goldfields were discovered and the mineowners' war waged than it had ever been since? There were two great evil principles at the very root of this infamous misgovernment in tropical Africa. One of them was the doctrine that the native had practically no rights whatever and no property and that he might be lawfully called upon to labour incessantly for the benefit of the white man, either without wages at all, or at wages wholly inadequate and fixed by his employer. The wages paid to a Congo native amounted to the magnificent total of 11s. per annum. In return for this, according to the Report of King Leopold's own Commission—

> "The native must every fortnight journey two days' march, sometimes further, in order to reach that part of the forest where he can find rubber vines. There he lives. . . . a miserable existence. He is compelled to build himself an improvised shelter. He has not the food to which he is accustomed; he is deprived of his wife, exposed to the climate, and the attacks of wild beasts. . . . He returns to his village where he can only remain two or three days before the new demand is made upon him."

The Belgian Prime Minister, M. de Naeyer, had said quite frankly—

> "The native is entitled to nothing."

This was simply the old pagan view of the barbarian as φύσει δοῦλος "a bondservant by nature"; but against this immoral and utterly unchristian doctrine every Liberal worthy of the name must utter his protest whether it was preached by a Belgian on the Congo or a British colonial in South Africa. The second evil principle to which he alluded was the deplorable usage, far too common amongst European Powers, of recklessly employing black troops of inferior civilisation to do their police work and act as their soldiers. The horrible outrages which had disgraced the Government and inflicted this long agony upon the desolate and oppressed people of the Congo State were directly due to the employment of armed savages—in some cases even cannibals—under the euphemistic name of "sentries" or "forest guards."

> "The black soldier," said the Report of the Belgian Commission, "left to himself falls back upon his sanguinary instincts."

Of course we were told that our own hands were not clean in these respects. He remembered that some weeks ago when he asked a question about the Congo, the hon. Member for Stoke, whose enviable versatility enabled him to deal with every conceivable topic of political interest, got up and asked what right we had to interfere in the Congo when we were engaged in a reckless and unjust war against the Zulus, or words to that effect. He freely granted that our hands were not clean in these respects. He had seen with his own eyes what the employment of semi-civilised troops might mean. Why, too, in Natal at this moment did we never hear of wounded Zulus—the proportion of wounded to killed would be something like five to one. They had better address that question to the black levies or the Government which sanctioned their employment in these inglorious slaughters—too much like rook shooting to be glorious; in fact, the parallel was very close, for he read the other day that forty Zulus had been shot sitting in the trees! And then let them remember that infernal picture of Christian vengeance which the Moslem fellaheen of Egypt lately witnessed. Oh, no! our hands were not clean; but still this argument was not in any way conclusive, and if pressed to its issue would really stultify all human efforts towards improvement. He felt sure that few Members of this House would be deceived by King Leopold's illusory promises of reform. Condemned even by his own picked Commission of inquiry, he now recommended, *inter alia*, that no European factory must possess more than twenty-five rifles of the newest pattern—merely a repetition of an old law, and containing no prohibition of rifles of older patterns. Again, sentries were not to be armed with breech-loading rifles—again a mere repetition of an old enactment which had never been observed. In short, these promised reforms were part and parcel of the same old game of bluff and hypocrisy played by King Leopold and his satellites. It was quite hopeless to expect justice under the existing *régime :* "What is law to me ?" said one of the agents to Mr. Harris, "I am sent here to get plenty of rubber—not to carry out law." He pleaded that something must be done. Surely this infamy could not be allowed to continue. The churches, alas, did not help as they should. There were forty Congo missionaries in this country to-day, and only two, as far as he was aware, were actively helping on the efforts for reform. This "immeasurable suffering" continued from year to year and the Churches of Christ looked on almost in silence! The immediate summoning of a Conference of the signatory Powers, the establishment of British Consuls and extra-territorial Courts and, for the moment, the rescue of our countryman Stannard from the vengeance of these official blackguards—these were the things that naturally suggested themselves. And further, never were the circumstances of the time more propitious for Congo reform than at present. We appeared to be on excellent terms with the French and the Germans, and Italy had come to regard King Leopold's system in its true light. At any rate something must be done and done speedily, for, otherwise, the Congo question would gradually solve itself by the virtual extinction of the people, and the utter destruction of the country's resources. From the shame of that terrible solution he trusted the civilisation of Europe might be saved. He appealed to fair-minded men in all parts of the House and in the country to support the Government in doing what it could to abolish this wicked and abominable system on the Congo, which might be described as the most terrible engine of human oppression and cruelty that the modern world had ever seen.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said that everyone who was in the House when the Secretary for Foreign Affairs was speaking, must have felt the importance of the present state of affairs in Egypt. He had listened with the utmost possible pain to the statement of the Foreign Secretary with regard to the Denshawi affair. It reminded him of the early "eighties," when the Liberal Party who were returned to power, as they had lately been, with a great majority, were shattered into fragments on the two questions of Egypt and of Ireland, when on those two questions the then Government departed from Liberal principles, and when the guns at Alexandria sealed the fate of the Party for many a year. It was a melancholy fact that when a Liberal Government was in power with a great majority at its back it forgot the principles which it had proclaimed loudest in Opposition. When he heard the Foreign Secretary ask the Committee to abstain from discussing the recent events in Egypt, and draw a terrible picture of the events which might follow any discussion, he asked himself how differently he would have spoken had he been in opposition. ["No, no."] Every word which fell from the right hon. Gentleman convinced him rather of the necessity of discussing the matter as leading him to believe that the case was even worse than he had supposed. When the right hon. Gentleman said that a wave of fanaticism had passed over Egypt, and spoke in tones which most profoundly affected the House as to the danger of discussion, he thought what a sad commentary it was on the twenty-five years of English rule in Egypt. He was old enough to remember all the ideal prospects held out to justify the Occupation. It was a preparation, it was said, for self-government by the Egyptians, and this was the only ground upon which the occupation was defended by the Liberal Party. The speech of the Foreign Secretary left little hope in that direction. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of Lord Cromer in the usual formula. Knowing something of Egypt, he declared that the government of Lord Cromer was the most undiluted, unqualified despotism the world had ever seen. In the main that despotism had been a benevolent one; he had effected a marvellous change in the condition of the Egyptian people. All credit for that he justly deserved; but at the same time even a benevolent despotism required careful watching, and particularly when that despotism rested upon an army of occupation. Never in history had there been such a condition of things in which great abuses had not arisen. Three distinct sets of circumstances were to be kept apart in connection with the Denshawi affair: the incidents connected with the outrage, the circumstances of the trial, and the circumstances in which the sentences were carried out. Why, and on whose responsibility, were the sentences carried out with such fearful rapidity? The Secretary for Foreign Affairs thought that he had removed all the impressions that were made by the telegrams which he characterised as incorrect. But here was the telegram—

> "The four natives who were condemned to death for the murder of Captain Bull and the attack on other British officers were hanged to-day. Six others, convicted of complicity, were flogged.
>
> "The prisoners were conveyed on carts from Shibin el Kum early to-day, guarded by a detachment of infantry. The gallows and whipping post followed. The cavalcade arrived at Denshawi at 7.40. Mr. Machell, Adviser to the Egyptian Minister of the Interior, selected the place close to the road where the executions were to take place, and a space 60 yards by 30 was roped in, the gallows and whipping post being erected in the centre.
>
> "The prisoners arrived at half-past one o'clock. One man was first hanged, and left hanging while two other were being whipped. Another was then hanged and two were whipped. The remaining two men sentenced to death were next hanged and the other culprits were flogged. Troops were posted round the enclosure, and hundreds of natives stood in a wide circle 200 yards distant. The women wailed dismally as the lash was applied and the prisoners were hanged. All the condemned men met their death with calm."

Not a word in the published accounts was inconsistent with the right hon. Gentleman's statement, and a more brutal, barbarous exhibition he had never heard of. This disgusting exhibition would remain for ever a stain on the history of the British occupation of Egypt. Was it expected by these methods to inspire respect for Christian civilisation and British government in Egypt? Some hon. Members opposite thought, and he did not blame them, that he had some desire to excuse the abuses which existed in the Congo Free State. That was not so, and the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had admitted that he was the first man to stand up and support him, when he first called attention to the question of the Congo Free State. What he said was, that it was a pity that in Natal and Egypt this country had done things and were doing things which made it impossible for us to exercise moral influence in Belgium or even in Russia. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that no official attempt had been made to prevent the publication of these details. But he found in the *Daily News* a statement that after the telegram had been sent out, Reuter's Agency sent out a circular requesting the British Press to suppress all allusion to the groans and cries of the women who were present at the executions. He thought some Government agent must have interfered. That was a most disgraceful transaction, because the public ought to be allowed to know these things. Speaking of the affray, the Foreign Secretary had stated that the evidence showed premeditation in regard to the attack upon British officers. What did the right hon. Gentleman mean by premeditation? The officers were part of a moving column passing through the country, and they had only arrived at the village the night before. On the following morning a local notable invited them to go pigeon-shooting in the village of Denshawi, thus leading the officers to believe that he had the consent of the villagers. Did the right hon. Gentleman charge this local notable with being in the conspiracy? This man provided the carriages and took the officers to the village, and he contended that there could not have been premeditation unless the notable was in the plot. On the 23rd of June, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which was rabidly anti-native in this matter, published a telegram from its Cairo correspondent, in which it was stated, that the fellaheen strongly objected to the pigeon-shooting on the ground that their crops would be destroyed and their stores burned. It was also said in this account that in the course of the trouble Major Pine

Coffin's gun went off and shot a native woman. In the official account, which was issued, as he thought, most improperly, by the adviser of the British Minister at Cairo before the trial took place, it was admitted that the officers commenced to shoot these tame pigeons without first obtaining the permission of the head man of the village, who was absent when they arrived. The issue of the official account before the trial was improper, because it must be remembered that in Egypt there was no such thing as an independent judge. Every judge in Egypt held his position by the favour of Lord Cromer, and he thought it was objectionable to issue a detailed account of the proceedings, coming from the Minister of Justice, some days before the trial. As he had said, in this official account it was admitted that the officers commenced to shoot without obtaining the permission of the head man of the village who was absent. Therefore, the officers were at that moment engaged, as he was informed, in an illegal act, it being the law in Egypt that before these tame pigeons, which belonged to the villagers, were shot, the consent of the head man should be obtained. The pigeons could not under the law be shot unless the necessary consent had been obtained and a sum of money paid. It was exceedingly hard to obtain trustworthy news from Egypt, and he did not accept as Gospel truth any of the accounts which had been received of this matter. There was the greatest possible confusion and conflict in regard to the most important event in connection with this occurrence, and that was in regard to the shooting of the native woman. There was no doubt that the greatest cruelty and brutality was shown by the fellaheen to the British officers, but it was the fact, that when the British troops arrived, they found a ring of men round the officers protecting them. The officers at that moment were surrounded by villagers who were guarding them. He had no doubt that great brutality was shown by the fellaheen, and it was said that a man jumped upon Major Pine Coffin. That officer, however, was evidently a man of great humanity, and he showed great courage and forbearance, controlling the men who came to his rescue. The brutality of the attack upon the officers was frankly admitted, and the whole question turned upon the point, which was in dispute, whether the woman who was shot and wounded, if not killed, was shot by one of the officers in mistake, of course, before the row broke out. If the woman was shot in the course of the controversy while the peasants were remonstrating with the officers, and before they struck any blow, it was monstrous to hang any of these natives. The Secretary of State had said that there was a wave of fanaticism passing over the country, and he was afraid there would be an advance of this wave of fanaticism unless steps were taken to stop events of this kind occurring. Hon. Members must not suppose that in Egypt we were dealing with an uncivilised race. On the contrary, it was a civilised race, consisting of an educated people, with a highly intelligent Press. News of incidents of this kind ran from one end of Africa to another. There was a very able native Press in Cairo, which was read extensively by the people of Egypt, and there was a University there attended by students from the whole Mohammedan world, and every detail of this transaction would be known throughout the Mohammedan world within a month. What was the Arabic account of this affair? He did not vouch for the truth of it, but he proceeded to read to the House an account of the affray supplied by a native correspondent to an Arabic newspaper in Cairo, the editor of which he (Mr. Dillon) knew to be an able and truthful Arab gentleman. He asked whether the Secretary of State imagined that he was going to cloak this business by preventing the House of Commons from discussing it. The whole Mohammedan world was discussing it to-day.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have promised a report of the evidence, a full report of the judgment and a full report of everything which has taken place. I have urged the House until they have got that report not to embark upon a discussion which is open to danger.

MR. DILLON said he had seen this kind of thing before. When the full report was received they would be asked why go back on these unhappy transactions. He then drew attention to the remarkable fact that the whole French Press at Cairo, which since the *entente* between this country and France had been friendly to Lord Cromer and Great Britain, condemned the transaction from beginning to end. He thought it was a most sinister fact that before the trial of the Egyptians took place, the Alexandria correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle* telegraphed that the natives would be severely dealt with, and the sentences would be carried out with military severity. To his mind these transactions savoured far more of a desire to strike terror than to do justice. If officers in Egypt, even if they were doing an illegal act, were brutally assaulted, their assailants should be punished, but in a way as to leave an impression on the minds of the people of Egypt that justice was being done. This policy of endeavouring to strike terror, these brutal, disgusting, and un-christian performances, was not calculated to recommend British rule to the people of Egypt. It was true—he admitted and rejoiced in the fact — that owing to his great ability and his sympathy with the people of Egypt, Lord Cromer had succeeded in twenty-five years in doing more to elevate the name of England in that region than had ever been done by an English Government before, but Lord Cromer had gained nothing of the confidence and love of the Egyptians. It was admitted by the Secretary of State that years ago the lash as a punishment in Egypt was abolished from the native law. It was left for a Christian court set up specially for the protection of British officers to order that men should be lashed in public before their women. Was that the way to recommend British civilisation and Christianity to the people of Egypt?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I cannot reply to the speech of the hon. Gentleman without doing what I am of opinion would be serious mischief—embarking upon a premature and dangerous discussion. If he had raised general questions of whether there should or should not be an interval between the passing of the sentence and the execution, or whether the code should be revised, and questions of that kind in the abstract, I should have nothing to say, because undoubtedly incidents of this sort do bring those questions under our consideration with regard to the future. But I am sorry—more sorry than I can say—that he has not responded to the appeal I made, and sorry that it is he who has not responded. He said he had seen this sort of thing before from Liberal Governments. He went back to 1880, but there was no analogy there with regard to Egypt, because we were not then in Egypt.

MR. DILLON: I referred to 1882 and the bombardment of Alexandria.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I know, but that is no analogy to the situation in Egypt, at the present time. Does he really believe that those of us who have been in Parliament now for more than twenty years, who have sympathised with the cause of Ireland, who have known, because we had to study it, the distress caused by the condition of the land question in Ireland, who have constantly voted with him and his friends against oppression in Ireland—does he think we have gone through all those twenty years without having learnt a great deal, without having become, I think, wiser and better politicians? That, I have no hesitation in saying, is one obligation which I shall always owe to the hon. Member and to his friends; through the difficulties of Ireland, and our association with them in difficult times, we have learnt more sympathy and more caution in being on our guard against oppression than we should have learnt but for that experience. But if he gets up in this House and makes statements, for the truth of which he says he cannot vouch, at a time when I have already promised the truth shall be given in full, how can he teach me further lessons in sympathy? He asks me questions which can only be answered by the evidence, which is not yet in my possession. Surely the hon. Member must know, as things are at present, that there is at the present moment no other course but to promise the House the fullest information I can give to them, and to say I accept responsibility for this; and I have enough confidence in the character of the tribunal to believe that I shall not have to regret taking that responsibility. I recognise the tribute that the hon. Member has paid to Lord Cromer. That tribute goes a long way in doing credit to Lord Cromer's work in Egypt; but when the hon. Member draws the conclusion that because a fanatical feeling, which is shared, not only in Egypt, but in North Africa, now exists there that work has not been so good as we have thought, I dispute that altogether. Between East and West, do what you like, whether it be for twenty years or for 200 years, all the material benefit of all your good rule will still leave a crust, and a thin one, between East and West. That has always been; and it is because it is so that in questions of this kind, whether it be Egypt or India, whether it be any other question affecting Eastern civilisation, I ask the House to be exceedingly careful; for by debate and language used in this House, you may set in motion forces, always near the surface, which if they once break forth will lead to consequences which I know the House will deplore. I must pass from that to other subjects.

With regard to the Japanese alliance, that alliance is still living and is in exceedingly good health. Japan is devoting that energy and public spirit which has produced such remarkable results in recent years to the arts of peace and civil government, to the guiding of Korea, a great task, and to the development of her own resources; and we in Asia are pursuing no adventurous or enterprising policy. On the contrary, it is one of consolidation; and the result of that situation in both nations is that the alliance which exists to-day gives a sense of mutual security to each without being a source of anxiety to anybody else. I trust it will long remain so, and that it may gain in strength and confidence on those terms.

With regard to France, the diplomatic support which the two countries have promised to each other has been forthcoming from either country without qualification and without reserve whenever occasion has arisen. I have but two things to say about our relations, our good understanding, with France. One is that that good understanding is not directed against any other country; and the second is that it must be recognised that that good understanding must not be impaired by any other development of our foreign policy. The more clearly these two things are borne in mind, the more clearly it will appear that for neither country is that good understanding a barrier or hindrance to good and cordial relations with other Powers. As to other countries in general, I will only say that the Government reflects, I believe, accurately the public opinion of this country. It is that we cherish no hostile design, diplomatic or other, against any of them. We do not bear any ill will to any other country whatever; and if evidence of that is wanted, I will only point to the recent remarkable readiness shown to give hospitality to and to receive hospitality from other countries.

Now, Sir, I pass from that to what was, after all, the main subject of debate this evening, and that is the Congo Free State. We have to look back at the origin of the Congo Free State and then to look at what has recently been disclosed to see how much there is which naturally appeals to public attention. The origin of the State was a fair one. It had its origin in 1884 in those declarations exchanged between the British Government and the International Association of the Congo, founded by His Majesty the King of the Belgians for the purpose of promoting civilisation "and other humane and benevolent purposes hereby declared." Our Government declared their sympathy with and approval of the humane and benevolent purposes of the Association and recognised the right of the Association to the Congo State. We have travelled a long way since these declarations. The International Association has disappeared—I do not know where—and as the realisation of the aspirations and expectations under which it was founded we have this Report on the state of things in the Congo by an inquiry appointed by its own Government. I am not surprised, and nobody is surprised, at the impression which has been produced by that report. The statements which were made by British missionaries in the Congo before the Report appeared can be discounted no longer, because the Report confirms them. There is, in my opinion, but one thing to be done in regard to those statements, and that is to give the fullest possible publicity to the evidence taken by the Commission and to carry out the reforms recommended in its Report. That is not the course that has been followed. The evidence has not been published. Another Commission was appointed to recommend in regard to reforms. The Report of that Commission has not been published at all; and the reforms which they are said to have recommended are in some material respects less than those that were recommended by the Commission of Inquiry. And that has been accompanied, not with a public expression leading us to believe that by the Government of the Congo the full extent of the mischief in that State has been realised, not with anything that would give us a full assurance that the conscience of the Government of that State has been so reached that matters would be improved in the future, but with a pronouncement of rights in which the Sovereign of the Congo State speaks less as a governor, and more as if he were the owner of private property. Even property has its duties as well as its rights; and every Sovereign of every State, though he has his rights, has also his obligations. If it is to be a question of the letter of rights in this matter, other people and other countries have their rights, too. There are treaty rights, and more than treaty rights. There is the point which the noble Lord opposite dealt with with such force, that if in the centre of Africa a great territory was allowed to fall into a state of bad government it must become a danger to the surrounding States. Some one said in the course of the debate that Mr. Root, the Foreign Secretary for the United States, had expressed a doubt of the right of the United States or of any of the other Powers to interfere in the affairs of the Congo. The United States is not a neighbour of the Congo State. But we know that when the United States had on its own borders a state of disorder which was found to be intolerable it took measures of its own to protect its own interests. That fact I lay stress on as an important factor in the case of the Congo. But let me add that, whatever we may say about the Congo State, we do not reflect upon Belgium, or upon the Belgians or upon Belgian officers. The hon. Member for South Monaghan quoted two letters which he said my brother had written to the Press on the Congo State. I am not sure that I have seen those letters; but I have heard from my brother, who has been many years in the Congo State, experiences which entirely bear out the quotations which have been made from his letters. I attach great importance to what he says, because I know him to be attached to accuracy to an extent rather rare in one who has travelled so much. He is, at any rate, likely to be an impartial witness. He has never been in the service of any administration, either Congo or British; but he has had great experience of the natives, having been engaged in private enterprises in Central Africa for many years and never having any trouble with them. He told me personally what he appears to have said in his letters to the Press, that the Belgian officers with whom he came into contact have been men who tried to do their duty. They had small experience of the country, and they may have made mistakes, but they have been humane men who tried to do their best in trying circumstances. In all that I need do nothing to corroborate what the hon. Member for South Monaghan said, but what the hon. Member for South Monaghan did not emphasise was that this statement was carefully limited. The region in question is the southern extremity of the Congo State. It is not in the rubber district. The Belgian officers of the Congo State who have been there have been there solely for the purpose of keeping order, and had nothing to do with the development and exploitation of the resources of the country. The evidence of Sir Harry Johnston about a different part of the Congo State is not relevant to the question of what has happened in the rubber-producing districts and districts conceded to various companies in the Congo State. The very neighbourhood of a man like Sir Harry Johnston or the very presence of British enterprise in any part of the Congo State would have been almost certain, I think, to do something to diminish the evils complained of. That has a great bearing on one remedy which has been suggested to-night—whether our consular jurisdiction should not be extended. It is true that by extending our consuls and consular jurisdiction we may not in theory touch the evils of which people have complained, but the mere presence of consuls of another country, distributed through the State, would be bound to have a beneficial effect on the administration and tend to check abuses in the State. As to the contention that forced labour in the Congo State is equivalent to a tax, it is true, no doubt, that forced labour may be equivalent to a tax. If a native cannot pay a tax and his labour is given to the State on that account, then you may call that labour virtually a tax. But this labour which is said to be instead of a tax in the Congo State, do we know that it goes into the pockets of the State or the public revenue? There are no public accounts, and so long as that is so and so long as this taxation or this labour is levied by companies working for profit, the Congo State must remain open to the reproach that it is imposing, not taxes, but forced labour for the purposes of private profit.

I come to the decrees and reforms which are to be applied. I think it right that our consuls should watch closely the application of these reforms. If carried out in a really good spirit they might produce a great change indeed. Large as their shortcomings are in some respects, they would undoubtedly be of much benefit. I would only refer hon. Members on that subject to the speech made by Lord Fitzmaurice in another place,† in which he described what a paradise the Congo State might be if these reforms were adequately carried out. Therefore, I do not care too much to examine the character of these reforms. It is easy enough to point out that they fall far short of what they might be, but if properly applied they might do a considerable amount of good. Their application should, no doubt, be watched. Even if we find no fault with the reforms on paper, I should still be distrustful as to the amount of good they would do, because the system is wrong. In the Congo State the State is a trader and you have private trading companies with administrative powers. We have always looked with suspicion upon the combination of trading rights and administration. That fact has always made this House most anxious with regard to its own chartered companies. If we have sanctioned that system, if to an increasingly limited extent it is still allowed to go on, yet we know that behind the chartered company there is the Colonial Office, and that behind the Colonial Office there is this House. There is besides the company the State itself—impartial, not interested in the profits of the company—which is over the company. Even so, we do not much like the system and gradually it has been contracted. The Niger Company, for instance—I believe one of the best chartered companies there ever was—was extinguished, I think, under the late Government. In the Congo State the State itself is a trader, and as long as that is so, I believe that is the real root of the mischief. Other European Countries which have had to deal with natives have at one time or other made mistakes which have had to be regretted; but where there is responsible government, if mischiefs occur, and even if they endure for a time, sooner or later no free Parliament will allow the continuance of the mischiefs; the thing cannot be indefinitely prolonged. But in the Congo State there is no responsible Government in that sense of the word. It has become more like a private possession, and what is really required is a change in the system. I am asked whether we will not have a conference with other Powers. Our record in this matter is a good one. We have once invited them to a conference, and I am ready to make it known again that if all or any of them will join with us in pressing for a change, we shall be only too ready to share in responsibility and in effort with them, and if any Power thinks it has a greater interest, directly or prospectively, in the Congo State than this country, we shall be ready to join with that country if it should desire to take the lead. Meanwhile, till such Power shows a disposition to take the matter up, I agree that the moment has come when we must consider what we ourselves ought to do. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1579.

Forest of Dean suggested bringing into existence the provisions about the Congo navigation. I think that needs the consent of other Powers. That is a suggestion which I do not dismiss, but I should like to examine it further. Then there is the question of free trade and the prohibition of monopolies. If there is talk of rights on the part of the Congo State, we must look into our rights, and we shall have to inquire how far it is consistent with the provisions of treaty rights and obligations that there should be these enormous reservations of huge areas of private property in the Congo State, and if there is dispute about those treaties there is the Hague Tribunal. Then there are our rights of consular jurisdiction, and the time must come when we shall have to consider whether, in the interests of better knowledge of what is going on—information hitherto so difficult to obtain—and the general interests of improvement in the Congo State, those rights should not be enforced. One remarkable change has taken place, and that is that the Belgian Parliament and people have shown an interest in this matter which promises to increase, and have begun to show a sense of responsibility which, in my opinion, is a most welcome and healthy sign. After all, the reform of the Congo State is the first business of Belgium, and the House must remember that it is very desirable not to take any steps which might have the effect of discouraging Belgium from taking the step which I think is so much to be desired—namely, to see to the reform of the Congo administration. If you establish extra-territorial jurisdiction it will discourage the interest which is now being shown in Belgium. Therefore, I will wait, and I rather think the noble Lord had this point in his mind when he assumed that this matter would be discussed in Belgium. I would like to leave it this evening, so that Belgium, so far as we are concerned, is encouraged and not embarassed by anything we may do. But we cannot wait for ever. We must make up our minds as to what our responsibility in the matter is, but in view of the remarkable awakening of interest which has been shown in Belgium, and in view of the fact that the matter must be further discussed in that country, before I commit his Majesty's Government to any definite steps, I should like to wait and see what the autumn may bring forth.

Sir Edward Grey.

Now I pass from the question of the Congo to one or two of the other questions which have been raised. I do not want to deal at length with Macedonia and the 3 per cent. Customs dues, because time is short and there are other questions still to be brought forward. But I should tell the House in regard to the Customs dues what I found when the present Government came into office. Negotiations had been begun in which, on behalf of this country, it was stipulated that there should be certain commercial concessions, improvement of the Custom houses, and improvement of the mining laws, and other matters. Communications had also been made that if financial reform was put on a satisfactory footing in Macedonia we should be prepared to concede the Customs dues in order to enable that scheme of reform in which Lord Lansdowne so earnestly co-operated to continue. So that the present Government did not come in with quite a free hand. Certain conditions had been stipulated for, and if the Porte fulfilled those conditions we were bound to agree to the increase of the 3 per cent. Then I was confronted with this situation. The Porte claimed that, after Lord Lansdowne had accepted the Financial Commission which the Porte had conceded, this country was bound in honour to agree to the increase of the 3 per cent. dues, and some of the other Powers showed great anxiety that we should agree from fear that, if we did not, the scheme of reforms in Macedonia might be wrecked. The other Powers were ready to agree. In looking into the matter, I came to the conclusion that the conditions stipulated for by Lord Lansdowne had not been fulfilled. The situation was this. Admitting that the Financial Commission would do much to improve the finances of Macedonia, still there was no guarantee that, if we agreed to the increase of the Customs, the money would be better collected or would be so placed that it would be devoted to Macedonian reforms. After some little time the other Powers, who had been so anxious we should agree, supported us in this point, and we al came into line as to the stipulation for these conditions to be conceded by the Porte. This was very satisfactory, because it is essential that the Powers should all be in line. If we had been left alone as the only Power against the increase of the Customs, the other Powers would naturally have held us responsible if the Financial Commission collapsed and the state of Macedonia got worse. If the Customs dues are going to be properly collected and applied to Macedonian reforms, then we ought to consent to the increase of the dues rather than see the Financial Commission starved for lack of funds. But if we gave way too easily, it would do no good to Macedonia and the money would be wasted. If, on the other hand, we continued to refuse, there was the danger that the scheme of the reforms would collapse. The situation was serious, because the deficits were not being met by the Porte as the Porte had engaged to do. The increase in the Customs could not come into operation for some months, because the increase required the assent of several Parliaments. Unless the money required to make up the deficits was forthcoming from the Porte, we were bound to raise the question whether the large military expenditure now being charged upon the Macedonian Budget ought to be allowed to continue. Our great object is to keep in step with other Powers or to keep them in step with us, as the case may be. The Financial Commission has undoubtedly done some good work. I think it is possible that it may do still more. But unless the funds are forthcoming, undoubtedly the situation will become more serious still, and at the present moment we are all agreed that pressure ought to be put upon the Porte to make up the deficit. Unless it is made up, the whole question of the amount of the military expenditure allowed to be placed on the Macedonian Budget will have to be revised.

As to China, the whole question of concessions in China is difficult at this moment. We hold that while the Chinese are perfectly entitled to claim for themselves a free hand in the future, they are bound to recognize the concessions and obligations into which they have entered in the past. I propose, when Sir Ernest Satow returns in a few days, to discuss with him the whole question of concessions in China, and to see whether we cannot arrive at some general settlement with the Chinese Government. With regard to the punishments inflicted in the mixed courts in the foreign settlements in China, I can only repeat again that these punishments are inflicted by Chinese magistrates in Chinese courts. It is true that our police arrest prisoners and bring them before those courts, and that a British assessor sits by the side of the magistrate. But the treaty says that the law administered shall be the law of the nationality to which the officer trying the case belongs. These punishments are inflicted by the Chinese not only in the foreign settlements, but through the whole of their own country. If China shows any desire to reform the sort of punishments that she inflicts upon her own subjects she will find no more willing sympathiser than us. But it is impossible in a large settlement like Shanghai, where there are hundreds of thousands of Chinese, that the Europeans should be responsible for all the punishments inflicted by Chinese courts on Chinese subjects according to Chinese law. And the danger of interfering is very great. The Chinese are extremely jealous of their rights. The other day, in the foreign settlement of Shanghai, the consuls laid down a rule that Chinese women brought before the Chinese Court were to be taken to the municipal or European prison, and not to the mixed court gaols, because, on grounds of humanity, they considered that the Chinese prison was not in a condition fit for the reception of female prisoners. A very laudable motive, but unfortunately an act that was not warranted by our treaty rights! The attempt to enforce it resulted in a protest by the Chinese magistrate and a struggle in court, and ended in a riot, in which one or two people lost their lives and much property was destroyed. It shows the danger of encroaching on Chinese jurisdiction in these foreign settlements. There are treaty rights and an established law and practice; but they cannot and must not be altered without the consent of the Chinese, and if you try you are bound to have trouble, for no nation is more jealous of its rights or knows better what those rights are than the Chinese.

There remains a final question and a difficult one, though one in which the House has shown much interest, and that is the question of our relations with the Russian Government and the visit of the British Fleet. I think that the less comment in this House on Russian affairs the better, but if we must comment on those affairs, let us understand quietly what the situation is. There are, no doubt, great troubles in Russia. There are now three authorities known to the outside world, and they are all recognised as playing a great part in Russian government. There are the Tsar, the Russian Ministers of the Central Government, and the authority represented by the Council of the Empire and the Duma. Not one of these three is responsible for these massacres in Russia, and there is not one of these three that does not deplore them. An hon. Member behind me said it has been proved that the Russian Government was involved in the Byalostok massacre and that the Duma itself had held an inquiry and made a report on the massacres. I do not understand that there was any charge made in the Duma by Prince Urusoff against the Central Government in St. Petersburg. On the contrary, the inquiry has led to an entirely opposite conclusion. I can give no information as to what happened at Byalostok, because three different inquiries have been made in Russia itself. But the Central Government neither knew nor was aware of what took place at Byalostok. Russia is an enormous country. Its organisation of officials all over the country is not thoroughly known to us, and when these disturbances and outrages take place in different parts of the country I am sure that you are adding to the difficulties which exist in Russia when it is assumed that it is the Central Government which is responsible. Then it is said that there should be official representations and so forth. Why I believe that there are three parties in Russia—the reactionaries, the reform party, and the revolutionists. I am certain of this, that any interference from any State whatever outside will not strengthen the reform party, but rather strengthen one of the other two parties. All history shows that this has been the result of interference from outside. Then as to the visit of the Fleet. The visit of the Fleet was settled some time ago. I am not sure whether it was settled before or after the Duma was summoned by the Tsar, and there was nothing inappropriate in the fact that as the Fleet was to go to the Baltic it should visit some of the Russian ports. As the Fleet went to the Baltic last year and did not visit Russian ports, it would surely be inappropriate if again this year when it went to the Baltic it should not visit any of the Russian ports. In Russia this year a Parliament had been summoned for the first time. It is a remarkable step in Russian history. I do not know why these misconceptions should arise with regard to the visits of the Fleet to the Baltic. Last year something of the same kind took place. The visit of the Fleet was planned early in the year, and it was to visit some of the German ports. Between the time when the visit was planned and when it took place certain events had occurred, and there was a report that the visit of the Fleet was deliberately intended as a sort of menancing comment on the events which had occurred long after the visit was originally planned. Nothing of the sort was, of course, intended, and the visit of the Fleet took place. Because certain things have happened since the cruise of the Fleet was originally planned, this time it is suggested that the cruise should be abandoned. Why? Because the idea is now that the visit of the Fleet, if it took place, must be intended or must be taken as a sort of commentary on the internal affairs of Russia or an indication of some intention on our part to take sides. The right hon. Baronet hoped that there would be no demonstration, on the occasion of the visit. I do not know what he means by "demonstrations." I think it is usual when the Fleet goes to the ports of a friendly country that the admirals and officers should be shown some civilities by some of the municipal authorities, by the officials of the Government, and so forth. If anything of that kind takes place, and the Fleet is shown civilities of that kind, I trust that such civilities as are shown will include the members of the Council of the Empire, the Duma, and the other branches of the State. If that is so, there can be no misconception. The Fleet goes without reference to the internal affairs of Russia. It goes to pay its compliment to the best of its ability to the Tsar, the head of the great Russian nation. It goes in a friendly spirit to the existing Russian Government, but I cannot imagine that its visit to the Russian ports has been fixed without its being arranged and understood that the visit is also intended for the Russian people. The hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil took the line that we ought not to take sides. The thing is impossible.

MR. KEIR HARDIE said the visit was not so much a question of taking sides as of being interpreted by the people as the taking of sides.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I cannot believe that this interpretation will be made, and I am in doubts whether that interpretation will be largely shared. But apart from the taking of sides, I ask would it be possible not to make it seem that there was a taking of sides if the Fleet did not visit the Russian ports? I look forward to increasing our good relations with the Russian Government and the Russian people. There is one safe rule to follow, and that is as far as we can to avoid comment and all interference. The agrarian question alone in Russia is probably more widespread, and on a larger scale perhaps, causing more acute distress, than any agrarian question we have known in the United Kingdom, and that is saying a good deal. The political troubles we all know, and we all realise that Russia is passing through a critical and difficult time—difficult for the people and difficult for the Government. Now for the first time she has her Parliament, and it seems to me through all that has happened there are signs of a vitality, energy, and an ability to work her way through to a great future. I am quite sure that the best thing we can do is to go on as we have been doing, trying to remove political difficulties which may exist between us, discussing difficult questions—difficult frontier questions—when they arise, preventing them from becoming difficult and clearing them away altogether when we can, which can do nothing but good; but so far as our ordinary action, visits of the Fleet, or anything else, is concerned, to go on our way without reference to internal difficulties in Russia in the belief that our sympathy, our help, can best be given by not interfering, and that sometimes as the best help in these matters is the least interference, so the best sympathy is silence.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON asked what limit was to be set to the veto on discussion by the plea of danger from fanatical movements, and did the Foreign Secretary quite realise what he had himself done by making this plea. Was it possible to give a greater stimulus to anything like a dangerous movement than was given by this avowal?

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow; Committee to sit again To-morrow.

WORCESTER ELECTION.

Message from the Lords [this day] relating to the Worcester Election read.

MESSAGE TO THE LORDS.

Resolved, That Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Causton, and the Comptroller of the Household, be appointed to present to His Majesty the said Address, with the Lords, as mentioned in their Lordships' Message.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

***MR. KEIR HARDIE** (Merthyr Tydvil) called attention to the prosecution of women advocates of woman's suffrage at Manchester and at the Marylebone Police Court. He asked whether the Home Secretary was aware that among the magistrates who sat on the Bench at Manchester was Mr. James Kendal, who was the chief steward at the Liberal demonstration from which the women were ejected. That was he thought a most improper proceeding. Surely in a case of this kind a person who was largely responsible for the disturbance which led to the trial, should not occupy a position on the bench, when the case came on. He also said, with reference to the women who had been sentenced in the Marylebone Police Court, that they indignantly denied that they had been guilty of a breach of the peace. They were charged with having committed a technical offence which they denied. With regard to the sentence passed on Miss Kenny, he said nothing except it was too heavy; with regard to the sentence passed on the other two women, they were offered the alternative of being bound over to keep the peace for 12 months or of going to prison for six weeks. They did not admit that they had committed any offence, and therefore being bound over to keep the peace would have been an admission on their parts of having been guilty of an offence they did not commit. With regard to one of these women, a woman of 64, all she did was to call out "Featherstone." He thought, under all the circumstances, the Home Secretary ought to reconsider the question, and consider the desirability of releasing these two women. There was a case in that morning's papers, in which a respectable woman had been wrongly arrested on a charge of soliciting. In that case it was made clear that the woman was wrongly treated, and if in a case of that kind an obvious mistake was made it was clear that in a case such as that to which he had alluded there ought to be a full and fair inquiry.

*Dr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey) joined in the appeal of the Member for Merthyr to the Home Secretary to reconsider the action taken by the magistrate in this matter. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had no right to ask for more protection than any other citizen, and he was glad to know that he protested against these women being prosecuted, and believed that had the right hon. Gentleman had his way there would have been no prosecution. He pointed out that Parliament was to blame; Parliament had never listened to a quiet demand for electoral reform. No great electoral reform had ever taken place without violence, and these women were only following the royal road which men had taken before them to secure electoral reforms. Many men who took part in pulling down the railings of Hyde Park in the sixties looked back with great glory to their achievement, and the same thing happened with regard to the claim to speak in public squares, when the President of the Local Government Board suffered imprisonment for endeavouring to secure the right of the people to speak in Trafalgar Square. He then suffered as these women were suffering to-day from a vindictive prosecution. He begged the right hon. Gentleman to reconsider the position.

*Mr. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness) reminded the House that during the Boer war many meetings were held to protest against that war, and men who committed the most brutal assaults on those taking part in those meetings were never prosecuted or imprisoned. This sentence was a brutal one and repugnant to his sense of justice.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) said that, having considered this case fully, it appeared to him that the magistrate had acted with great discretion. The magistrate did not sentence these ladies. He bound them over in their own recognisances in £50 to keep the peace for twelve months. They could come out of prison any moment they liked by entering into their own recognisances. That being so, he had nothing to add to what he had said at Question time.

Mr. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston) said he thought the magistrate had behaved with exceeding kindness to the women, and he had listened with the utmost indignation to the words of the hon. Member for Merthyr about "Featherstone." They all knew what was meant, and they knew the repeated and dastardly attack that had been made upon the present Chancellor of the Exchequer by the Labour Party and these women. He held that these women were guilty of an abominable libel in the reference to Featherstone which they hurled at the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Under all the circumstances he considered the sentences were very lenient.

And, it being half-past Eleven of the Clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at half-past Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 6th July, 1906.

WORCESTER ELECTION.

Message from the Commons that they have appointed Mr. Sinclair, Mr Harcourt, Mr. Causton, and the Comptroller of the Household to go with the Lords mentioned in their Lordships' message to wait upon His Majesty with the Address relative to the election for the city of Worcester.

EARLDOM OF NORFOLK.

Committee for Privileges met: Counsel further heard on behalf of the Duke of Norfolk: Committee adjourned to Monday next.

WORCESTER ELECTION.

The King's answer to the Address, reported by the Lord Steward (*E. Liverpool*), as follows:

"I have received the Joint Address of the two Houses of Parliament in reference to the Report made by the judges selected to try a Petition in respect of the Election and Return for the city of Worcester; and I have given directions accordingly for the appointments of the Gentlemen named in the Address to be Commissioners for the purpose of making the inquiry prayed for."

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3); Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes); Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8).

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill: Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Great Northern Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Bury Corporation Bill [H.L.], Commons Amendments considered and agreed to.

Corporation of London Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill, Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

South Suburban Gas Bill, Read 3ª, and passed.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill, Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [H.L.], Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7.) Bill, Brought from the Commons.

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill, Brought from the Commons, read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill. Read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 153.)

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.], Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Order in Council, dated June 30th, 1906, entitled "The East Africa and Uganda (Currency) Order in Council, 1906," amending the East Africa and Uganda (Currency) Order in Council, 1905. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON ACT, 1898 (UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON (TRANSFER) ACT, 1905).

Statutes made by the Senate of the University of London, in pursuance of the University College, London (Transfer) Act, 1905, for the management of the University College, London, and Amendments to existing statutes in connection therewith.

Statutes made by the University College Transfer Commissioners for regulating the constitution and management of (*a*) University College School, Hampstead; (*b*) the North London or University College Hospital, and the school of advanced medical studies connected therewith; and orders made by the Commissioners supplemented to the above statutes.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 152.)

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

I. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of—

Light railways in the parish and urban district of Woking and in the parishes of Chobham, Horsell, and Windlesham, in the rural district of Chertsey, all in the county of Surrey.

Light railways in the urban district of Stretford, in the county palatine of Lancaster.

Additional light railways in the parish of Davyhulme, in the rural district of Barton-upon-Irwell, and in the parish and urban district of Stretford, in the county of Lancaster.

II. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade.

Reviving the powers granted and extending the period limited by the Canterbury and Herne Bay Light Railway Order, 1903, for the compulsory purchase of lands and extending the period limited by that Order for the completion of the railway works by that Order authorised.

Authorising the construction of a light railway in the county of Kent from Headcorne to Maidstone.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

TIDWORTH BARRACKS.

EARL BATHURST: My Lords, I rise to ask the Under-Secretary of State for War whether His Majesty's Government intend to build either a hospital, a church, or recreation rooms at Tidworth Barracks. I think it must have caused some of your Lordships considerable surprise, on reading the Question which stands in my name, to find that in barracks which have so recently been built on the most modern and approved lines there is no church, hospital, or recreation room provided for the men. Your Lordships know the enormous sums that have been spent by the late Government in purchasing Salisbury Plain, in building barracks, and in constructing railways—in fact, in making the place suitable in every way for the manœuvring of troops; and no doubt your Lordships had the comfortable assurance that while all this money was being spent adequate provision was being made in the matter of hospital, church, and recreation room accommodation for the men. I admit that I was among that class until about two months ago, when I went to Salisbury Plain with my Militia. I found that at Tidworth Barracks, which are the headquarters of the Southern Command and also of the Seventh Infantry Brigade, and where four battalions of the Line are stationed, there is no such accommodation as I have referred to. There are other buildings still wanted, such as married quarters for officers and men, but I do not intend to refer to them this evening, as no doubt they will be added later on. But the question of hospital accommodation is, in my opinion, one that should really be looked into. The contractors who built the barracks and constructed the railway line had a stipulation in their contract that in the tin houses erected for the navvies and builders engaged in the work adequate provision should be made in the way of church, hospital, and recreation rooms. But during all the time that the barracks were being built it apparently never occurred that this accommodation was also required for our soldiers.

I should like to take, first, the question of hospitals. No doubt my noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War will inform your Lordships that there is ample hospital accommodation at Bulford. Bulford is four miles from Tidworth, and the road is straight over the downs. I think it is very hard that a man who has broken his leg or his arm, or has met with a more serious accident, should be put into an ambulance and jogged across the open plain to Bulford Hospital. Take another case. Take a case in winter of a man suffering from a very bad cold or a bad chill. He is taken first to one small room at Tidworth Barracks which has been fitted up as a kind of receiving hospital, but he cannot be kept there for more than one day. In the event of his developing pneumonia or some still more serious illness, he is at once put into an ambulance wagon and bumped over the plain, possibly in pouring rain. The track may be very slippery and almost a quagmire in places, and sometimes it may be almost impassable through frost or snow. I am sure your Lordships will agree that this is not as it should be, and not the way our soldiers should be treated.

Much has been heard lately of bettering the conditions under which our soldiers live, but the reverse has been the policy in connection with Tidworth Barracks. I should like to know whether my noble friend is aware of the number of desertions which have occurred on Salisbury Plain during the last two years. If so, I feel sure he will look into this matter and commence the building of these conveniences for the men as soon as possible. The noble Earl may say that it was the fault of the late Government and that they ought to have erected these buildings. Possibly they ought, but I should like to ask him if, on taking office, he found that there were any contracts for providing this accommodation, and, if so, how soon the work will be begun. I bring forward this question purely in the interest of our troops. I am sure yonr Lordships will feel that it is a most important matter, and I shall be only too pleased if the noble Earl can give me a satisfactory answer.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): My Lords, I quite appreciate the spirit in which my noble friend has brought forward this matter, and in reply to his Question I may tell him that plans for a hospital at Tidworth have been approved and that the necessary funds have just been allocated. We hope, therefore, to proceed with the building at as early a date as possible. Then, as regards the church, it was hoped to include this service in the military works loan programme, but I am sorry to say that that proposal, in common with many others, has suffered in consequence of the general decision of the Government that expenditure under the Works Act should be reduced to a minimum. I can, I fear, hold out no hope that this service will be proceeded with at present, but the Army Council recognises as fully as the noble Earl does its importance, and will not lose sight of it when any money is available.

My noble friend also asks a question about recreation rooms at Tidworth Barracks. With regard to that, I am not quite clear what it is my noble friend alludes to. Tidworth Barracks are quite new and up-to-date, and they are, I am informed, provided with recreation rooms on a liberal scale. It is possible that my noble friend may be thinking of recreation grounds, and I may tell him, in regard to that matter, that in the final loan programme now being considered by the Army Council the sum of £1,500 has been taken up for the provision of recreation grounds for the men at Tidworth Barracks.

THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER: My Lords, the answer which has just been given on behalf of the War Office is somewhat indefinite. We feel that we are placed in considerable difficulty in this neighbourhood owing to the presence of troops. I have had my attention called to one special aspect of the difficulty, arising from the occasional death of a soldier. In that event he is buried in the churchyard. I do not know whether this is the case at Tidworth, but the difficulties that are produced among the inhabitants of the parishes concerned are sometimes exceedingly great on account of the extra pressure put upon the accommodation of the churchyard. The request for church accommodation is a very real and a very important one for the inhabitants of the neighbourhood, and I earnestly trust that the War Office will see its way to make the necessary provision.

The LORD ARCHBISHOP of CANTERBURY: My Lords, I should like to endorse what has been said by my right rev. Brother the Bishop of Winchester. When the original arrangements were contemplated and then carried out for so very greatly enlarging the number of troops who were to be in that region on the borders of Hampshire, we understood that there was no question at all that we should see all the necessary accompaniments for the higher well-being of the soldiers speedily carried into effect; and it has been a very great disappointment to those who have the highest interest at heart alike of the soldier and of the inhabitants of the parishes in which they are encamped that no steps more practical have been taken to give effect to what was comtemplated. What seems to have been left to the last is the accommodation which would enable these men to lead the best kind of lives, and to have help of a moral and religious sort which is so essential everywhere, and not least in regions where troops are isolated from other opportunities of a helpful and wholesome sort. My noble friend who spoke on behalf of the War Office said that this matter will be attended to when there is money in hand; I hope it will not be left in that somewhat vague and unsatisfactory position, but that we shall before long receive some practical assurance that the buildings are to be proceeded with.

The Earl of DONOUGHMORE: Can the noble Earl the Under-Secretary tell us whether the plans for this hospital as now approved differ very materially in form from the plans that were approved last year?

The Earl of PORTSMOUTH: It is rather difficult for me to answer in detail, but, having seen the plans, my impression is that they do not differ very materially.

CHINESE ON THE RAND.

The LORD BISHOP of HEREFORD: My Lords, I rise to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can fully explain the circumstances under which licences for the introduction to the Rand mines of 16,000 additional Chinese coolies were issued all at once last autumn; what reasons of urgency, if any, existed for such a wholesale issue at that particular moment; and what officials were directly or indirectly responsible for this proceeding, and whether they were aware of the opinion expressed by the then Secretary of State that it was desirable to suspend the issue of further licences; and what assurance he can give that the portion of those 16,000 licences still unused will now be cancelled so that the importation of Chinese may now cease.

Since my Question was put on the Paper I understand that it has been partially answered in another place. At the same time I feel that there are points in it which deserve a further answer, and I hope, therefore, that the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies will forgive my venturing still to put the Question to him. If he should think it right to repeat any answers that have been already given I feel that the repetition will do good, on the sound principle, *repetitio docet*. In putting the Question I wish to assure the noble Earl that I myself and a very large number of persons up and down the country, especially among the middle and working classes, who feel exactly as I do on this matter, desire in no way to hamper the noble Earl in the administration of the very difficult task imposed upon him. We know too well what a difficult task it is, what a *damnosa hereditas* he has come into, and what a battle he has to fight. Our desire is to help him. If I may use the phrase, in this Battle of Amalek we wish to hold up his hand so that he may be strengthened to carry his efforts to final conclusion, and we believe that we strengthen him by reminding him of the intense feeling which prevails in the country on this subject.

I am very well aware that in certain quarters attempts are made to make light of this feeling, but there is no doubt about it that the great mass of Christian people in this country feel very deeply and very intensely on this matter of Chinese servitude under the Ordinance—and we are not content to call it by any other name than Chinese servitude. As I have said, we are well aware that this feeling is ignored, or attempted to be ignored, in various quarters. I believe it is really ignored in the minds of those who, seeing things under modern influences and through what I might venture to call a certain South African golden haze, are no longer able to distinguish between freedom and slavery, or the essentials of freedom and the essentials of slavery as they used to be understood when I was a young man. Yet, again, I am conscious that there are a good many persons, some in this House and a good many in the Metropolis, who live so detached from the great streams of the national life among the common people that they do not understand the intensity of the feeling on this question, and it is because we desire to keep before the mind of the noble Earl how very deep and real this feeling is in the minds of the mass of serious English people that we venture to press this question.

There are many other questions which we should like to ask the noble Earl, only we do not wish to hamper him in any way. There are questions arising in the minds of most of us every day to which we should like to be sure that the right answer is being given. For instance, why should not the employers of this great multitude of foreign serfs bear all the expenditure on the special police supervision necessary in consequence of the importation of the Chinese into the country? Again, why should they not be liable for all damage done by such serfs as escape from their confinement? If any of us happen to own a dog which worries a farmer's sheep we are liable for damages. I think the analogy applies exactly. These men the moment they escape into freedom become deserters and outlaws, and a danger—a fearful danger—to society. I think it is reasonable that, under these circumstances, whatever damage they do should be compensated by their employers.

Then, with regard to the outrages, we do keep asking ourselves every day how long are our fellow-subjects in South Africa to live under such conditions as we hear of day by day? I wonder sometimes what would be the feeling expressed in this House if we who are members of it had to sleep every night with a revolver or rifle by our side, and if we did not dare to leave our country homes even to attend this House because of our fear lest our homes should be blown up by dynamite and our children and wives should suffer we know not what outrage. I maintain that if we are to have an Empire of which we may be truly proud the conditions of free and happy life should be the same in every part. But, in spite of all these feelings, I do not put these questions to the noble Earl, because I do not wish to hamper him. The question which I put has, however, one or two details in it which I venture to think deserve further consideration.

I have not been able to find out what urgency existed last November for the issue of so many thousands of fresh licences, and there are many people in the country who would be glad to be shown that that was necessary. Still more, I fail entirely to understand why the officials on the spot at that time did not act on the advice of the late Colonial Secretary and refuse to issue that enormous number of additional and prospective licences. As I understand the Ordinance, it was quite within the power of the high officials on the spot to have held their hand and to have said, "No. You have the advice of the Colonial Secretary that it is desirable to suspend the issue of licences. We will follow that advice." If that had been done I think we should never have heard of those 16,000 licences being issued. Finally, I still desire to ask the noble Earl—When will the actual importation cease? I understand that that question has been in a sense answered in another place, but it would be a satisfaction to some of us to know whether, as a matter of fact, after next November no single Chinese serf will be allowed to set foot in South Africa. That is really the point we wish to arrive at, so that we may then be able to say that wherever a man sets his foot within the British Empire he is a free man. That completes the questions I have to ask the noble Earl.

My last word shall be a simple and plain word on the moral aspect of this question. We cannot but have felt, your Lordships generally must have felt, that it was somewhat surprising that we heard so little in public concerning the moral aspect of this great question. I therefore desire to press it on the noble Earl's attention for the moment, and I do so for two reasons. My first reason is this, that our commercial Empire is suffering from what I hold to be a very ominous growth of servile labour, and of all forms of servile labour that under the Chinese Ordinance is infinitely the worse with which I have become acquainted. I hold—I may be wrong—that one of the great moral dangers of which we have to think in connection with the administration of this vast Empire of ours is this growth of indentured servile labour. Your Lordships may perhaps feel that an assertion of that kind from a person like myself is not of much value. I will therefore venture to quote what was lately said by a very distinguished Englishman on this subject, one of the most distinguished men of letters and historians living amongst us—Mr. Frederic Harrison. Mr. Harrison, after referring to the seriousness to the Empire of the increasing magnitude of the servile problem, goes on to remind us how adventurous spirits, generally calling themselves Imperialists, and thirsting to make fortunes in haste, are helping to increase what is a very ominous danger to the Empire. Another thing he reminds us of is this, that under these and other influences the British horror of all forms of slavery—which was so ardent in the first half of the ninteenth century and was inspired, let us always remember, by the Gospel as the rule of life, which was the inspiration of men like Clarkson and Wilberforce—has been steadily evaporating of late years, to the tremendous loss of our national character.

My other reason for reminding the noble Earl of the moral aspect of the question is that it has been so little noticed in the public discussion of this Chinese business. I sometimes think that a great many persons who touch upon the question of Chinese serfdom in South Africa pass over this moral aspect from feelings of decency. They do not like to concentrate the attention of their hearers on the moral corruption which must inevitably ensue to a whole community by introducing this aggregation of many thousands of low-class celibate serfs into that community. I desire to say, with all possible emphasis, that in the opinion of all Christian people it is herein lies the abomination of this business. It is on this account that we desire to see the immigration cease. I hope the noble Earl and his colleagues will be able to rid our Empire of this morally unclean state of things which I hold to be a discredit to our name as a Christian country. I put the Question standing in my name.

The Lord Bishop of Hereford.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of ELGIN): My Lords, I hope I may assure the right rev. Prelate that I entirely appreciate the good will he has expressed and his intention. I am by no means ignorant of the fact that he represents a great mass of feeling in this country. The right rev. Prelate referred particularly to the necessity for additional police protection against outrages which have occurred in connection with the presence of Chinese coolies in the Transvaal. We have had a good deal of communication with the High Commissioner on the subject, and we have every hope that the precautions he is prepared to take, following the recommendations of a Committee he appointed, will have the effect of checking these lamentable occurrences.

I may add that I have always expressed it as my opinion that the cost of the additional police superintendence which is required in this connection might very fairly be a charge on the industry which employs Chinese labour; for that would be only following precedent common in this country, to the effect that when large works are undertaken and there is a large influx of population, sometimes of a rough description, into a particular locality, it is within the power and it may be the duty of the local authority in charge of the police, not only to add to the strength the force, but to call upon the employers of that labour to contribute to the cost incurred on their account.

Really in answer to the Question on the Paper I have little to say that I have not said before or which has not appeared in Papers presented to Parliament. I may just repeat shortly, as the right rev. Prelate thinks that repetition may do good in this matter, that the position in regard to these licences is this. When we came into office we found these licences had been issued; we took the best legal advice on the subject from the Attorney-General of the Transvaal and from our own advisers in this country; and we came to the conclusion that, these licences having been legally issued, we could not set them aside without arbitrary action or *ex post facto* legislation, and we thought it our duty to take the less objectionable course.

I do not know that it would serve any useful purpose to review again the circumstances in which the licences were issued or examine the question whether there was premeditation involved. With astute business men it is quite possible that, engaged as they were in a speculative enterprise, they were acute enough to foresee the course of events. At any rate, I am convinced in my own mind that, so far as Government is concerned, both in the colony and at home, there was no collusion in the matter. In the colony the issue of licences was in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor. I have had the advantage of more than one interview with the Lieutenant-Governor, and I feel certain that there was nothing in connection with his issue of these licences inconsistent with the high character which Sir A. Lawley bears as a servant of the Crown.

With regard to the Government at home, I ventured in an earlier debate to express an opinion that they had very considerable responsibility in the matter. I thought then, and I still think, that their management of the whole transaction was so loose and inaccurate that it gave an opportunity for the introduction into what was, or ought to have been, an experimental stage conditions that gave a far greater amount of permanency than they probably were aware of. The right rev. Prelate has referred to a telegram which has been mentioned before, and which is not printed, but is referred to in the Papers which have been laid before your Lordships, in which my predecessor expressed an opinion that the mineowners would be wise if they suspended importation. These words occurred as a mere *obiter dictum* at the end of a telegram upon other matters, and were in no sense an instruction from the Secretary of State; it was not addressed to the Lieutenant-Governor, but it came, I believe, into his hands, and it was therefore not surprising if it was not acted upon by the Lieutenant-Governor or communicated to mineowners.

The right rev. Prelate has asked in his Question what assurance I can give that the portion of these 16,000 licences still unused will now be cancelled so that the importation of Chinese may cease. The announcement has been made in another place that we propose to fix November 30th as the date upon which the devolution of the functions of the Consular officers in China to Transvaal immigration authorities shall cease. In our opinion that is the easiest and simplest way of stopping further importation; but I should like to say that in this matter we have by no means departed from the position we took up at the beginning in regarding the validity of these licences as established. The calculation we received on December 30th last was that, taking the shipments at 1,900 coolies per ship, the 16,000 coolies could be and might be, imported by October next, but in order to give a margin, and not to deal unfairly in this matter, we have fixed November 30th as the date at which importation in any new form should cease. I do not mean to say—and I hope the right rev. Prelate will not misunderstand me—that a ship may not arrive with coolies on board after that date, because, as I say, it is on that date that we withdraw the power of recruiting in China. At any rate before the end of the year their importation into the Colony will have ceased, and my belief is that the whole of the coolies that are to be imported will be imported before that time.

I should like to say that we believe this to be a necessary part of the policy which we put before your Lordships earlier in the session. We announced that it was in our view necessary that the present Ordinance, the conditions of which we consider undesirable, should cease before the new Government of the Transvaal took up its duties. In order that this end may be achieved, we think it is necessary that this date should be fixed, and that there should be no longer a question of the importation of additional coolies during the time at which we hope the general elections for these new bodies are proceeding.

I hope that your Lordships will agree that when questions of this character have been raised I have endeavoured to deal with them guardedly and in a moderate manner; but I should be sorry if the right rev. Prelate, or any of those who think very keenly on this subject in a different direction from that of noble Lords on the other side of the House, thought that this proceeded from any difference on my part from the policy which has been declared on the part of the Government in another place with great courage and with great self-restraint by my hon. friend who represents the Colonial Office in that House. On the contrary, I am bound to confess that the effect on my mind of the transactions in which I have been compelled to bear a part is increasingly this—that under present conditions the position of this question is becoming increasingly untenable, and that there are conditions in the Ordinance which to my mind are inconsistent with the rights of free labour, which are the tradition of the British Empire.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the right rev. Prelate treated your Lordships to a repetition of arguments which have been many times used in this House, and some of which, at any rate, I must say seem to me to lose a great deal of force when considered by the light of the facts of which we have now become aware. The right rev. Prelate reaffirmed his belief that the Chinese coolies could only be properly described as slaves. I was under the impression that the question of slavery had been disposed of by the statement made in this House earlier by my noble friend Lord Crewe, who used these words—

"I also, like my noble friend behind me—

I think he referred to the noble Marquess the Leader of the House—

"have never used the word 'slavery' in connection with the importation of Chinese coolies into South Africa because I do not regard it as an accurate term."

Not only is that the case, but, unless I am very much mistaken, we now know that these Chinamen, having been given an opportunity of leaving South Africa and of returning to their own country on extremely tempting, if not extravagantly generous, terms, have only availed themselves to a very limited degree of the opportunity thus placed within their reach. If I am correct in that statement it seems to me, by itself, to be sufficient to dispose of the charge of slavery.

My Lords, I make no complaint whatever of the manner in which the Colonial Secretary referred to the part taken by the High Commissioner and by the Lieutenant-Governor in the matter of the licences for these 16,000 men. It is admitted that the licences were issued by the Lieutenant-Governor in accordance with the regulations then in force and in the discharge of what he conceived to be his right and his duty. But, my Lords, I noticed one expression that fell from the noble Earl which seemed to me to require a little further elucidation. He spoke, as I understood him, in reference to this particular transaction, of what he called the loose and inaccurate conduct of His Majesty's late Ministers. Now, my Lords, it is perfectly clear that the issue of these licences took place without the knowledge of the Secretary of State, and that the local authorities were fully competent to issue them, and for the life of me I cannot see where the charge of looseness and inaccuracy comes in. I should not have risen from my place to-night had it not been for that incidental expression made use of by the noble Earl.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, I cannot share the feeling of my noble friend who has just sat down, who seemed to condemn the course followed by my right rev. friend, if he will allow me to call him so, in bringing this subject before your Lordships. We all know the strength of the feelings of my right rev. friend. He has said nothing to-night which he has not said before. He has only repeated that which, from very strong conviction, he has long entertained, and I am bound to say I think he was perfectedly entitled to do that, and to lay before your Lordships the view which he takes of this question.

The right rev. Prelate considers that the system which exists in regard to Chinese labour in South Africa is a system of slavery. I do not agree with the right rev. Prelate. I have always said in this House and outside that the particular expression "slavery" did not apply to this case. I have called it "semi-slavery;" others have described it as "tainted with slavery." Those expressions I accept; to those expressions I adhere; but I have never myself called it a system of slavery, nor do I call it so now. I do not know that I should have followed the brief remarks of my noble friend opposite had it not been for what he said with regard to one expression which fell from my noble friend behind me, the Secretary of State, in which he criticised what he described as the loose proceedings of His Majesty's late Government. I have no wish to make this a question between the two Governments. I understood my noble friend the Secretary of State to refer to this fact, that whereas there was an indication in a telegram from Mr. Lyttelton that he, the then Secretary of State, thought it would be wise on the part of the mine owners in South Africa to suspend, for the time at all events, the importation of Chinese into that country, nothing came of that expression, and that, instead of suspending it, the mineowners asked for a very much larger number to be imported. While I do not wish to criticise the language of Mr. Lyttelton, I still hold that that was a loose method of conducting business. I think that that expression of opinion on the part of Mr. Lyttelton should have been communicated to the mineowners. If it was not communicated to them, as I understand was the case, then, of course, they are not responsible for having set it aside, but it does indicate, in my opinion, precisely that which my noble friend described as a loose mode of conducting public business. That, I think, was what my noble friend meant, and I hold that it was a fair and just criticism. The steps which His Majesty's Government have taken are intended to bring the importation of Chinese labourers under indenture into the Transvaal to an end at the close of the present year—at an end, that is to say, before the new Legislature in the Transvaal comes into operation. That will leave to them a fair and free field for dealing with this question, and it will put an end, until they have dealt with it, to a system which, whatever noble Lords opposite may think of it, is a system largely and widely and honestly condemned by a large portion of the people of this country.

LORD STANMORE: My Lords, the right rev. Prelate in his speech to-night brought to your Lordships' notice the moral aspect of the importation of Chinese indentured labour into South Africa. I think he was quite right, for the matter is a very grave one. I should like to point out to him, and also to the House, that if the presence of indentured labour be required in South Africa, it is not necessary to resort to the drastic remedy that the right rev. Prelate suggests of sending all these immigrants out of the country. The dangers apprehended might to a great degree be met by the adoption in that colony of the law which, as I have repeatedly pointed out in this House, is enforced in every other colony introducing immigrant indentured labour —namely, that no large number of male immigrants should be allowed to be introduced unless accompanied by a proportion, though not an equal proportion, of female immigrants. I wish to point that out to the right rev. Prelate and to the House, and I should like to see some notice taken by His Majesty's Ministers of the repeated warnings that I have given in regard to the subject. There is the grave danger; it has been pointed out repeatedly, and has been dwelt on by the most rev. Primate the Archbishop of Canterbury. I will not say there is any one in fault. Without knowing all the circumstances I do not desire to imply blame; but this I do say, that unless there are reasons accounting for it the apparent indifference to that matter would appear to imply a callous disregard of the moral dangers involved in the question, both on the part of the local authorities in South Africa and of His Majesty's Government both past and present at home.

CONVEYANCING BILL [H.L.]; SETTLED LAND BILL [H.L.];

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL [H.L.].

Amendments reported (according to order), and Bills to be read 3^a on Tuesday next.

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 6th July, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Metropolitan Railway Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways Bill

[Lords]; Manchester Churches Bill [Lords]; Newtownards Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill. Not amended, considered.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Kent Electric Power Bill [Lords]. To be read a second time upon Monday next.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill. As amended, considered. Read the third time, and passed.

Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments. Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP H).

Mr. MOONEY reported from the Committee on Group H of Private Bills. That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to: Midland Railway Bill; Uxbridge Gas Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to: Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway Bill [Lords]; Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill [Lords]; Clacton Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Newport Harbour Commissioners Bill [Lords]; Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund) Bill [Lords]; Sheffield District Railway Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Altrincham Urban District Council Tramways, Dewsbury Corporation Tramways, Newcastle-upon-Tyne Corporation Tramways, Ossett Corporation Tramways, Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Port Seton Extension) and Rochdale Corporation Tramways." [Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Aylesbury, Boston, Castle Ward, Weetslade, and Cramlington, Godalming (Extension), Gomersal, Henley-on-Thames, Pinner, Stanmore, Harrow Weald, and Edgware, Ryton, Swanage, and Wantage and District." [Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords].

Public Accounts. That they give leave to the Clerk of the Parliaments to attend to be examined as a witness before the Select Committee of this House on Public Accounts.

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 301.]

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time. Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 302.]

PETITIONS.

BETTING AND GAMBLING.

Petition from Dundee, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; From Aldenham; Beckford (three); Crediton; North Curry; and St. Hilary; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS) TEACHING.

Two Petitions from Llangynidr, against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.

Petition from Wycombe, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION, &c., (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; From Langside; and, Townhead; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from London, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON ACT, 1898, AND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON (TRANSFER) ACT, 1905.

Copy presented of Statutes made by the Senate of the University of London, in pursuance of the University College, London (Transfer), Act, 1905, for the management of the University College, London, and Amendments to existing Statutes in connection therewith [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 241.]

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented of Order in Council, dated June 30th, 1906, entitled "The East Africa and Uganda (Currency) Order in Council, 1906," amending the East Africa and Uganda (Currency) Order in Council, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, revising the powers granted and extending the period limited by the Canterbury and Herne Bay Light Railway Order, 1903, for the compulsory purchase of lands and extending the period limited by that Order for the completion of the railway and works by that Order authorised [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Kent, from Headcorn to Maidstone [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the urban district of Stretford, in the County Palatine of Lancaster [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of additional Light Railways in the parish of Daveyhulme, in the rural district of Barton-upon-Irwell, and in the parish and urban district of Stretford, in the county of Lancaster [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the parish and urban district of Woking, and in the parishes of Chobham, Horsell, and Windlesham, in the rural district of Chertsey, all in the county of Surrey [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON (TRANSFER), ACT, 1905.

Copy presented, of Statutes made by the University Transfer Commissions for regulating the Constitution and Management of (*a*) University College School, Hampstead, (*b*) the North London or University College Hospital and the School of Advanced Medical Studies connected therewith, and Orders made by the Commissioners supplemental to the above Statutes [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 240.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Telegraph Boys doing Sorters' work at Carlisle.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that at Carlisle, telegraph boys, at wages of 8s. a week, are being employed from 5.30 p.m. to 9.30 p.m., doing work proper to sorting clerks and postmen, whose wages range from 24s. to 48s. a week; and whether he will take steps to stop this practice.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It is the practice of the Department to employ senior telegraph messengers on minor postal duties when it is necessary to do so. I am not, however, acquainted with the particular circumstances in the case now referred to. I will have inquiry made, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

Classification of Sub-postmasters.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will state how sub-postmasters are classified; what superannuation or retiring allowance are the members of each class entitled to; whether length of service and acknowledged efficiency count in calculating the pension given to those officers; and, if so, will he state the particulars.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The vast majority of sub-postmasters carry on at the same time a private business, and gave a part of their time only to the public service. These are remunerated by commission, and are not entitled to any pension. There are a few who receive a fixed salary, and, being members of the Civil Service, receive pensions on the conditions laid down by the Superannuation Acts for the Civil Service generally.

Wages of Athea and Knockdown Rural Postmen.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General, whether he is aware that when T. Fitzgerald was appointed rural postman for the districts of Athea and Knockdown, in the county of Limerick, his wages were 11s. per week; that since his route was changed from a walking distance to a cycling one, his wages have been reduced to 6s. 6d. a week and 1s. cleaning allowance for bicycle, supplied by the Post Office officials; and whether as the bicycle is constantly getting out of repair, and has to be sent to Limerick, a distance over twenty miles, to be repaired, during which time the postman has to walk the route, which is a very long one, he will allow him to buy a machine and increase his wages to a fair standard.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have called for a Report on this subject, and on its receipt I will communicate with the hon. Member.

Revenue Bill—Industrial Alcohol.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he purposes proceeding with the Revenue Bill; and whether he is aware that, whereas the Germans sell industrial alcohol at a uniform price of nine pence per gallon, the conditions of the Bill will not reduce the manufacturing price in this country below the cost of one shilling per gallon.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I trust that it will be possible to take the further stages of the Revenue Bill after the adjournment to the autumn. As regards the latter part of the Question, I would refer the hon. Member to Section 38 of the Report of the Departmental Committee on Industrial Alcohol [Cd. 2472]. I have no reason to suppose that when the Bill has become law the user of alcohol for manufacturing purposes in this country will be at any disadvantage as compared with his German competitor.

Education Bill—Position of Transferred Voluntary Schools.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the President of the Board of Education what will now be the position in respect of Clause 4, as amended, of voluntary schools transferred to a county council, as provided schools, under leases from year to year, with no rent or with a nominal rent, as, for example, in Gloucestershire, Nymphsfield church school and Stonehouse national school.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Schools that have been transferred under the Act of 1870 to local authorities, and are council schools at the time of the passing of the Bill, will not come within the definition of "existing voluntary schools," in Section 13 (1) of the Bill, and will therefore not be open to the provisions of Clauses 2, 3, or 4 of the Bill. I may add that neither of the schools named in the Question is in an urban area, and would therefore on that account not, in any case, have been within the provisions of Clause 4.

Certified Efficient Schools and Religious Instruction.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the President of the Board of Education, if the managers of a certified efficient school under the new Clause 3 (1) (*b*) of the Education Bill will be free to enter into agreements, which teachers may be prepared to accept, on the subject of religious instruction.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The managers of a certified efficient school, receiving neither State-aid nor rate-aid, will not be under the provisions of the Bill that relate to schools receiving either or both of those forms of public money.

Teachers and Religious Instruction.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the President of the Board of Education if the Board will recognise a teacher as part of the staff of a State-aided school if the teacher makes or enters into an agreement with the manager, binding him to give religious instruction, whether of a general or special character.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Answer is in the affirmative.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: To ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in the event of the managers of a State-aided school making an agreement with a teacher which contains an undertaking on the part of that teacher to give religious instruction of some special character not permitted under Section 14 of the Act of 1870, this Board would consider themselves bound under Section 7 (2) of the Education Bill to withhold the Parliamentary Grant from the school.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Answer is in the negative.

Retirement of Clerks to Surveyors of Taxes.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the case of a clerk in the office of the Inspectors of Taxes, in Edinburgh, who has just been retired on reaching the age of sixty-two, after thirty-nine years service: whether that age is the limit fixed for retirement on pension of established officers; and whether, having regard to the fact that the clerk in question, who had most confidential duties to discharge, was only in receipt of 30s. per week up till eight years ago, and has never received more than 60s.per week, and that only for the last nine months, an inquiry will be made into the case with the view of granting some suitable provision for the man's old age.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) My attention has been called to this case. The clerk referred to was in the personal employment of the Inspector of Taxes, and is therefore ineligible for any award under the Superannuation Acts, but it is proposed to award to him a gratuity. The normal age for retirement on pension of officers of the Inland Revenue is sixty-two.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Thomas Dooner.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received the renewed application for reinstatement made by Thomas Dooner, on the Blennerhassett estate, near Beaufort, county Kerry; and whether they have taken any, and, if so, what steps to deal with the application.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received from Thomas Dooner an application for reinstatement on the estate in question and have referred the case to an inspector for inquiry and report. The Commissioners will, when the circumstances are fully before them, consider what steps it may be desirable to take in the matter.

Bann Drainage Scheme.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if any, and, if so, what steps have been taken to carry into effect Sir Alexander Binnie's Report in connection wth the Bann drainage.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) This matter is engaging my attention. The views of persons locally interested are being obtained; the Board of Works is considering the Report, and indeed the whole subject; and a valuer has been appointed who is immediately to examine and report upon the lands which would be beneficially affected by a drainage scheme. There are many details which need to be considered before action can be taken.

Result of Abbeyleix Police Inquiry.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what is the result of the police inquiry recently held at Abbeyleix.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) Assuming that the hon. Member refers to the inquiry into the case of Head Constable Spence, I beg to refer to my reply to the Question of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh on the 4th instant.† The head constable was exonerated.

Building grants for Irish National Schools.

MR. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Commissioners of National Education are unable, through want of funds, to grant aid towards the erection of new schools; and whether, seeing that the necessity for such grants exists and is admitted by the Board's inspectors, he can say what steps, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I beg to refer to the Answer which I gave to the Question on this subject put by the hon. Member for Mid Armagh on the 4th instant.‡

THE DEBATE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs), on a point of order, asked whether the rules of the House allowed hon. Members who were shut out from the debate last night to express their repudiation of the doctrine that the British were the oppressors of natives races.

NEW WRIT.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) moved the following motion:—"That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland to make out a new writ for the election of a Member to serve in the present Parliament for the county of East Tyrone, in the room of Patrick Charles Doogan, Esq., deceased." He had to acknowledge, he said, that this was an unusual proceeding, and therefore, if the House would allow him, he desired to say a few words in explanation. If this were a purely Nationalist seat he certainly would not have taken the course he now did. He had known in the past Nationalist seats in Ireland to be vacant for many months, and in one case for a year. He took no action then because it was to him a matter of satisfaction to have one Nationalist less in the House. This was a peculiar case, and for the last few years the pendulum had been swinging in the Unionist direction. There would be no surprise in the constituency, for a Unionist candidate had been before it for some time, and a Nationalist candidate had also been selected. The question was, what should be the date of the election? The hon. and learned Member for Waterford and his friends had one great advantage over the Unionists. The selection of a candidate to contest a constituency was no trouble whatever to them. Their candidates were not selected by the constituency; they were selected by the superior officers of the Nationalist Party, and so there was no difficulty in getting a candidate. Therefore the hon. and learned Member for Waterford had nothing to do but to consider the question of the time of the election. Representations had been made to them from East Tyrone that the electors desired that the election should take place without delay, and that accounted for the action he was now taking.

MR. PAUL (Northampton): On a point of order I wish to know whether the right hon. Member, not being a Member of the Party to which the late Mr. Doogan belonged, is entitled to make this Motion without public notice.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think public notice is required. Notice should be given by the right hon. Gentleman to the Whips of the Party to which the deceased Member belonged, and I believe that has been done.

---

† See Col. 51.

‡ See Col. 50.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said he would now say why the constituency desired that there should be an election. For some reason or other the hon. and learned Member for Waterford and his friends thought it would be better to postpone the election. He (Colonel Saunderson) did not think it would be to the advantage of the Unionists. They desired the election to take place without unnecessary delay. Already three weeks or more had elapsed since the death of the late Member, and if the writ was issued forthwith more than a month would have intervened before the election took place. He thought it was contrary to constitutional principles that anybody in this House should have the power of disfranchising a county or a division; and therefore he hoped that before long the issue of a writ would be an automatic process, and that after a certain lapse of time, say three weeks or a month, a writ would be automatically issued by Mr. Speaker. He dared say it would be said that an election taking place immediately might be dangerous, because it was so near to July 12th, but he could assure the House that the July 12th celebrations passed off almost invariably without any disturbance at all. Hon. Gentlemen below the gangway laughed, but perhaps they would give an instance of a breach of the peace having occurred on that occasion. He did not deny that there were warm times between the two parties at other periods, but July 12th had always been understood by the Roman Catholics and the Protestants as not one of those occasions. They never interfered with them, but had allowed the Unionist celebrations to take place from time immemorial, and so Unionists conceded to them like peaceable celebrations on Lady Day and St. Patrick's Day. That argument, therefore, would not hold water. Believing the postponement of the election was doing a wrong to Unionist electors in East Tyrone who wanted the opportunity of an early record of their votes, he now moved this Motion.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) seconded.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland to make out a new writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the county of Tyrone (East Tyrone) in the room of Patrick Charles Doogan, esquire, deceased."—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said the speech of the right hon. and gallant Member in moving the Motion had one thing to recommend it to the House. It was an exceedingly frank speech. He did not for a moment disguise his real object in moving the Motion. He commenced by saying that he was taking an unusual course. He had taken a most unusual course. The rule with reference to the isssue of writs was perfectly well-known to every Member. The moving of these writs was by unwritten and invariable rule left in the hands of the representative of the Party to which the late Member belonged. Of course there had been exceptions where what had been regarded by the House as unreasonable and unexplained delay had occurred in moving writs, and in cases of that kind after notice had been served on the Party an independent Member had moved the writ and it had been issued. It was essential for the hon. and gallant Member, in order to bring himself in conformity with the traditions of the House, to prove that there had been in this case some unreasonable and unexplained delay. Mr. Doogan died on June 16th, and it was therefore less than three weeks since he was interred. He doubted whether there was a single precedent in the proceedings of the House of an independent Member belonging to another Party intervening to move the issue of the writ after a delay of only a fortnight or three weeks. Therefore he said that the unwritten and invariable rule of the House was against the right hon. and gallant Member, and if he left the case there without another word he would be justified in asking the House to refuse the Motion. But there was something more to be said. The right hon. and gallant Member could not pretend to the House that he did not know the answer which would spring to the lips of every

Member when the Motion was made. He was not going to give instances of disturbances on July 12th; a more foolish and ridiculous task could not be imposed on anyone. Everyone who had ever been responsible in any degree for the Government of Ireland on either side of the House knew perfectly well that there was a period about July 12th when the public peace of certain parts of Ulster was endangered, and it had been the custom of successive Governments to draft large bodies of police there; and to select for a contested election in this constituency, where Party feeling ran high, a date about that time was a proceeding so reckless that he could not conceive how the right hon. and gallant Member could suggest it to the House, and he was sure that no man with any sense of public responsibility would aid the right hon. Gentleman in his effort. Some of his colleagues had gone through contests, and they knew that when in addition to the ordinary celebrations there was to be added the excitement and fervour of a contested election, there could be only one result. There would be not merely disturbance of the peace, but actual bloodshed, and he denounced the action taken by the right hon. and gallant Member as one which showed that for a small Party gain men in responsible positions in the Unionist set in Ireland were prepared to endanger the public peace and bring about bloodshed in Ulster. He would tell the House exactly what was the object of the Motion. This was a fairly evenly balanced constituency. In the last election the Nationalists won by about thirty votes. He won, no doubt, by the votes of a certain number of Protestant farmers in the constituency. He was very proud of the fact that they were able in Ulster to win seats for Nationalists by the aid of Protestant votes, but if this election were precipitated about July 12th, when riots were taking place between bodies of Catholics and Orangemen, did not every sensible man know that this quiet respectable body of farmers would remain at home, and not vote at all? That was the object of the Motion, and he confidently asked the House to scout it. Their only object in delaying the issue of the writ was that the election might go over this period of excitement, and it was his intention, if the Motion were negatived, to move the issue of the writ next week, which would bring the election on after July 12th. He therefore asked the House to reject the Motion.

*MR. SPEAKER: I think it is right to point out to the hon. and learned Gentleman that if the House refuses today to issue this writ he cannot make a similar Motion during the present session.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he would ask in that case whether it would be in order for him to move the adjournment of the debate until a particular date. If he moved the adjournment without specifying a date, the Motion might be brought up again on Monday. If in order, he would move the adjournment of the debate until next Thursday.

*MR. SPEAKER: That Motion will be quite in order.

MR. DODD (Tryone, N.) said he had great pleasure in seconding the Resolution. He was interested to this extent in the matter, that he was Member for an adjoining constituency. He was further interested in that he held a commission as one of His Majesty's sergeants-at-law in Ireland, and he was desirous of the peace, good-will, and order of the constituency. The fact was very familiar to every barrister who practised on the northern circuits in Ireland that for a period of something like three weeks from July 1st, when the flags were flown from the church steeples, until July 25th, when they were withdrawn, the ordinary courtesies of life between Catholic and Protestant were suspended. The right hon. Gentleman had said there had been no invasion of the peace on July 12th of late years. That was because their Catholic friends had conceded it to them. He did not know whether the House remembered the genial personality of William Johnstone of Ballykilbeg. He was a genial and kindly person for eleven months of the year, kind and cordial to all his Catholic friends, but from the time when the flag was flown to the time it was taken away he would have "no trafficking with traitors." The sentiment of Sir Samuel Fergusson's poem became a vitality in the North of Ireland. It was a poem that was written about the state of affairs in 1848. An Orange farmer went up to the castle at Dublin to get a gun for the purpose of defending himself against the supposed inroads of his Catholic neighbours, and the then Chief Secretary of the day was supposed to have said to him, "You won't object to mix with the ranks of the loyal Catholics." The answer was prompt and decisive.

> "Says I, make no excuse, I pray,
> For asking me to serve that way.
> We won't consider the trouble much,
> For we don't allow there's any such."

To that abiding feeling was added the speeches of the orators, including the right hon. Gentleman, and sermons delivered by preachers of the Gospel, who ought to proclaim peace and goodwill, but who raised something like a religious crusade, leading these Orangemen to stray from the paths of peace and quietness that ought to characterise the Protestant religion of which they were the practical adherents. Aroused by that enthusiasm no person could say that there was anything like judicial calm in Ireland during July. He spoke with knowledge of what had occurred. Judges had consulted him when fixing the summer circuits, and they had always to arrange with reference to the 12th. On one occasion he made a mistake, and they were unfortunately holding the Armagh Assizes when the Orange procession came past. First there was entreaty that they would not pass by the court house. Next there was a command, next there was a judicial order. All were flouted, all were disobeyed, and the judge, after having attempted to listen to him for a few minutes, being a classical scholar, made the only really good Latin pun that had been made on circuit, because he took the quill pen with which he was taking his notes, flung it down on his note book, and said, "*Inter arma leges silent*," which freely interpreted meant that when the 12th was approaching there was no room for judicial personages in the county. There was no room either for a contested election. He had contested North Antrim in July, and for three days he had to keep himself secreted, and he was beaten by 2,000 votes. The last election took place in the calm of winter. Did hon. Members really think that a verdict got under such circumstances in July would be worth having Were they content with having a verdict from a jury drunk with enthusiasm, religious fervour, and perhaps something more stimulating. [A NATIONALIST Member: "Whiskey."] He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that it was the courtesy and forbearance of the Catholics that enabled these processions to be held. On these occasions Members of Parliament and candidates withdrew to their rooms. The police absented themselves, riots reigned, and it was like pandemonium. Unless that was done there was no peace. He was in great sympathy with Orangemen. He had defended them at Armagh, Monaghan, and Belfast and he had had forty in the dock at one time. He had heard Presbyterian clergyman after clergyman called before the judge to give evidence of character to gentlemen who had invaded the law and been guilty of acts of violence, and the clergyman had said—

> "The accused is a good man—one of the best in my congregation—an elder of the church, a good citizen whom we have known for years. He is a man with a family, and it would be hard for him to be sent to gaol."

The learned judge, a strong and able man, after taking notes of the evidence of character replied—

> "I have listened to the character given, and I have every reason to believe that it is true. The unfortunate thing is that gentlemen of your character think they are entitled at this particular period to ignore the common obligations of citizenship, and therefore the sentence is that you get five years' penal servitude."

That was a very powerful deterrent. His people had appealed to him and had asked, "Have we not a right to march through Connemara as well as the Orangeman." He generally replied, "Yes, you have that right, no doubt, but it is a right that you had far better forego than insist upon, it is a right which has not sprung from courtesy and forbearance; we have beaten our antagonists at the poll, we have beaten them in argument, now let us see if we can't beat them in courtesy and fair play." As far as possible they desired that there should be no tumult or riot. The proposition he made to the House was that it was unfair to the Executive in Ireland to add to the religious feeling and the fervour of religious belief at that particular period of the year when the people were aroused and excited to something like fanaticism. At such a time it was greatly to be regretted that the Executive should be burdened by having to march extra police into East Tyrone for nothing else but to secure a shadowy victory for the Unionist Party. Why did the right hon. and gallant Gentleman object to deferring this election for a week? Was he afraid they would lose? In Ireland they were anxious for good government. They were anxious for law and order, and it was not his business to say anything that would inflame either Orangemen or Nationalists. His lifelong hope and expectation was that sooner or later they would all shake hands across the Boyne and try to make Ireland a peaceful, united country such as they had in England, Scotland and Wales. He seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned till Thursday next."—(*Mr. John Redmond.*)

*MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) desired to repudiate the statements made by the hon. and learned Member who had just sat down. The hon. and learned Member had said that the last thing he wanted to do was to create differences or ill-feeling between Nationalists and Orangemen, but at the same time he said that during the month of July all ordinary courtesies between Roman Catholics and Orangemen were suspended. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: It is absolutely true.] He absolutely denied that. He came from a part of Ireland where there were Roman Catholics and Nationalists, and he said that in the majority of cases July 12th passed off wthout disturbance of any sort. The hon. and learned Member for North Tyrone was not an Orangeman, but he belonged to the denomination from which Orangemen were most largely drawn, and for him to make the statement that judicial calm in Ireland was conspicuous by its absence during that period was, to say the least, an extraordinary thing for one who knew the facts as he did to say. It was no use for him to try to convert the House of Commons to the idea that July 12th was a perfectly peaceful day, but such was the fact, and he could not allow the occasion to pass when such unjust accusations were made against Orangemen without some attempt at repudiating them. He wished to put on record a strong denial that such a state of things existed as had been described by the hon. and learned Members for Waterford and North Tyrone. In this case all they wanted was that the election would take place without undue delay. The holding of the election near the 12th July would have no effect at all on the election. If the Protestant farmer wished to vote for a Nationalist candidate, which he did not himself believe, he was perfectly certain he would be able to go his misguided way and vote for the Nationalist even if the election took place on July 12th. The reason why they wanted this election was that it was getting near the time of the year when people would go for their holidays, when they could not get a verdict of the constituency so well, or if they did get it properly they got it at considerable expense and trouble in bringing people back from their holidays. Having obtained from the hon. and learned Member for Waterford the statement that the writ would be moved on Thursday he thought he might say for his part that no further objection would be taken.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) said he thought it right to make some reply to the hon. Member for North Tyrone. The Motion before the House was that this debate should be adjourned till the July 12th. It was well known to hon. Members below the gangway that Orange Members would find it their pleasure to be performing duties elsewhere on that day. Therefore he objected to the adjournment being made till July 12th on the ground that it was impossible for him to be in his place on that day. He wished to say that he was delighted, at all events, that the Grand Orange Order had impressed hon. Members opposite with the magnitude of its ramifications and also with the importance of the position which it held in this country. Although they were in a small minority in the House and in

Ireland, they had a right to consideration in connection with the issue of the writ for a constituency which returned the late Member by such a small majority. It was on these grounds that the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh moved for the writ, and he could only say in associating himself with the rest of the Ulster Party that they were delighted that the object which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had in view had been achieved, viz., by the bringing on of this election at the earliest possible moment.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: As far as I am concerned, I accept the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate adjourned accordingly.

YARMOUTH ELECTION PETITION.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) moved "That this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the Report of the proceedings on the trial of the Election petition for Yarmouth, and the complaints that have been made of the partisan and political character of the conduct during the trial of that petition of Mr. Justice Grantham." He said he was fully sensible of the great responsibility attaching to the bringing forward of a Motion of this kind. He admitted that such a Motion was not justified unless there was no other procedure competent. It was important that nothing should be done which would be a source of danger to the electoral life of the country, or which would involve the danger of lowering the dignity of the judicial bench, or create want of confidence in the proper administration of the law. It was absolutely certain that both Houses of Parliament had got what was called a controlling power over the Judges of the land. That controlling power had been expounded from their places in the House of Commons by no fewer than three Prime Ministers. It had been acknowledged by Sir Robert Peel in 1843, by Lord Palmerston in 1856, and by Mr. Gladstone in 1872. It must not be forgotten that under the Act of Settlement both Houses of Parliament had been invested with the protection and guardianship of the integrity of the bench. The judicial bench, as the House knew, had been surrounded, and properly surrounded, by many protections against improper and even proper criticism, when that criticism would be regarded as not of advantage, and as tending to the degradation of the bench as a whole. The House had to submit to a self-denying ordinance in this matter. They did not discuss the salaries of the judges which were charged on the Consolidated Fund. They did not criticise in ordinary debate the action of the Judges. The House had the right and the privilege of exercising control over the Judges either by criticism or in the last resort by an Address to the Crown for the removal of a judge. He admitted that it had been held to be in accordance with constitutional practice that such procedure in this country should not be instituted unless the *prima facie* case against a judge was so strong as to justify an Address. There was some slight misapprehension as to the practice, which, perhaps, he had better explain. Of course, the ordinary rule for the dismissal of a Judge was an Address of both Houses of Parliament to the Crown for his dismissal. That Address must proceed in the first instance from the House of Commons, but before the House of Commons could undertake the Address it must be supported by evidence, and that evidence was generally obtained first of all by a *prima facie* case, made out before a Committee. It was upon the report of the Committee that the House acted. He would now proceed to state the circumstances under which this Motion was submitted. The hearing of the election petition for Great Yarmouth took place during some eight days, and the disclosures startled the public conscience in an unusual degree. He did not recollect any display of popular feeling so great and so deep as was caused by the result of that petition, and likewise, he was sorry to say, in regard to the conduct of one of the Judges. It was undoubted that corruption, gross, open, and palpable, prevailed, that votes were openly bought and sold, that voters were carted to the polling places, and that the chief participator in this orgy of corruption was stated by one Judge not to come within the definition of an agent so as to make the sitting Member, the respondent, liable, while Mr. Justice Channell stated on the same occasion that the evidence showing that this man was an agent was so clear that to take him out of the category of agency would be tantamount to subverting and nullifying the decisions of nearly all the judges of the High Court on that subject. What happened after the judgment was given? All the Press, from *The Times* upwards or downwards, spoke of it as a great miscarriage of justice. People outside this House spoke of it with indignation, and that indignation was echoed and re-echoed in the corridors of the House. It would be a very bad and sad day for any free people if, when the people were excited with jealousy in this way, its House of Representatives did not respond to and reciprocate that feeling. After the decision of the judges in this petition people asked whether the Corrupt Practices Act was blotted out of the Statute Book, and whether the representatives of the people in this House were going to take action in the matter. After a pause of two or three days, he on his own initiative, gave notice of the Motion he now moved. He was not a Member of any of the English political Parties, and he had no political interest to serve in this matter. He was interested in the purity of elections and the independence of Parliament. In bringing forward the Motion he took the somewhat unusual course of reading it to the House instead of putting in on the Paper. The very sympathetic cheers with which that notice was greeted showed him that he had the sense of the great majority of the House with him. The memorial which he presented to the Prime Minister for a day for the discussion of the Motion was supported in a manner which, he believed, was without parallel in Parliamentary history. Within three days 347 Members, a numerical majority of the whole House, signed the requisition to the Prime Minister asking that facilities should be given for the discussion, among them their dear and lamented friend, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, who had ever been active in every good cause for liberty and freedom. His general charge against Mr. Justice Grantham was that as an election judge he brought to bear on the decision of an election petition a mind so biassed by political prejudice as to render him incompetent to give a fair and impartial judgment. He would also prove that his conduct on the bench was unjudicial, calculated to lower the dignity of the bench as a revered institution, and to cast no credit on his fellow Judges. The whole effect of these proceedings—and, of course, they in the House of Commons had to judge of the whole effect—was to generate very strongly a want of confidence in the administration of the law. He objected, first of all, to the political bearing and demeanour of the Judge during the trial, which lasted eight days. His method of considering and interpreting Acts of Parliament was most unusual, unconstitutional, and almost illegal. Again, Mr. Justice Grantham had used the judicial seat as a bulwark to attack the House of Commons, the Prime Minister, and the Government of the day, and to provoke angry political passion. The charges he was making were so serious that he must substantiate them by evidence. The first charge he made had reference to the character and sayings of the Judge. These appeared on every page of the report of the election petition trials. If there was one thing more than another absolutely essential in a Judge who respected himself and the bench, it was that he should not identify himself with political partisanship, and should convey no impression of being a political partisan. Mr. Gill, the counsel for the petitioner, in the course of his address handed to the Judge a pamphlet of a very atrocious character, which advised the voters to take money from both sides and to lie to both sides. Mr. Justice Grantham, after examining it, laughingly observed:

> "I thought it might have been a Birrelling Bill in support of secular education."

Mr. Gill's speech was not in the authorised report, but he quoted the incident from an affidavit made by the representative of the Press Association. This observation was made at a time when the Education Bill was under consideration in this House and was rousing fierce sentiments. This was the Judge who was supposed to be holding the balance! Then they had at page 12 of the report of

Mr. Justice Grantham's Judgment the following—

> "Prior to the election a bill was issued in the town in the colours of one Party, the Conservative Party, issued by a person who does not conceal his name—I suppose a real person, it is said so—telling the people to take money. And as there are in this town, as well as in other towns, a good many people who are ignorant; a good many people who only know the politics of the Party by the colour under which they fight—a good many people reading a bill of this sort would assume that this bill was issued with the authority and approval of the Conservative Party in Yarmouth. Now, this bill distinctly tells them with reference to bribes that there are bribers about—that bribery is rampant—take the money; you are justified in taking it and lying as to the way you vote."

Then there came up a question about a Mr. Belcher who had a series of letters after his name. At page 81 of the report, Mr. Gill asked a witness—

> "Is Mr. Belcher, Mr. Walter Belcher, F.C.L.A.? What does that mean?" (A)—"I could not tell you."

Mr. Justice Grantham interjected the suggestion that the letters might be the certificate of a lunatic asylum. Turning to page 134, the Judge's animus with reference to the man who had passed an examination and who happened to be a Liberal agent was manifest. A question was asked by Mr. Gill, who had asked him to come and be a witness?—

> "Mr. Belcher, the Liberal agent."

Whereupon Mr. Justice Grantham said—

> "The gentleman who rejoices in the letters F.C.L.A."

Mr. Dickens then said—

> "If your Lordship knew what that means you would approve of it. With a view of getting a better class of agent they have to pass three examinations before they can become a member of the association."

Judges had to be very careful, in small towns especially, as the eyes of the world were upon them. On May 2nd a number of witnesses were examined with reference to their attendance at the At Home given on October 19th. That was the strongest At Home ever given in the history of society. The invitation appeared in the newspapers, and was given to everyone—

> "Mr. and Mrs. Fell At Home in Great Yarmouth Town Hall, to meet Sir John Colomb."

As many as twenty-four bottles of whisky were consumed, and one of the guests walked straight into the river from that At Home. What had Mr. Justice Grantham to say about that? During the time the election petition was being tried an entertainment was given by the Mayor of Great Yarmouth, who, he believed, was a Liberal. At that dinner Mr. Justice Grantham made a speech in which he referred to the election—

*Mr. SPEAKER said he understood that the hon. Member was going to refer to something which did not occur during the trial of the election petition. If so, the hon. Member would not be in order.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said that this occurred during the trial of the election petition.

Mr. SPEAKER said did not the terms of the hon. Member's Motion refer to the conduct of the Judge sitting as a Judge trying an election petition.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL said that when he framed his Motion he meant that he would be able to state that the conduct of the learned Judge during the trial of the election petition would be subject to review. He had an affidavit from Edward Horner Jones, Congregational minister, who was present at that dinner, and who made oath as follows—

> "Mr. Justice Grantham said: 'I do not know whether my friend, Mr. Dickens, will not hold that such a spread as this comes under the head of corrupt treating; and I am afraid I may be convicted myself. My friend, the Town Clerk, and I are agreed that anything over 2d. per head is an orgy.'"

And then Mr. Justice Grantham went on to say in the same speech—

> "I am pleased to see my dear friend, Sir John Colomb, here. I have continued confidence in him."

Now, confidence was a very right thing to have in a friend, but why should the learned Judge go out of his way to talk in that style of a gentleman who would be before him next morning as a witness? It was quite clear that Mr Justice Grantham was unconsciously influenced by his surroundings to give two distinct and different judgments upon what were practically the same facts at Great Yarmouth and at Bodmin. At Great Yarmouth he spoke in terms of quasi-apology of the drinking habits of the people; whereas in his judgment at Bodmin he could not be too strong as to their drinking habits there. He held at Great Yarmouth that the At Home of October 19th might be given by the Conservative candidate because there was no general election imminent; but he held at Bodmin that the party given by Lord and Lady Clifden, the parents of the Liberal candidate, Mr. Agar Robarts, in the middle of September, was highly improper, because it was on the eve of a general election! These two conflicting decisions showed that so influenced was the Judge in the discharge of his duty by political bias that he had forgotten his own previous judgment. Then there was a question whether Baker, who distributed sums of money among the electors at Yarmouth, telling them to vote for the Conservative candidate, was an agent. Mr. Justice Channell, in his luminous judgment, went into the whole question of principal and agent. This man Baker was a boatman in a small way; and at the time he was distributing half-crowns amongst electors his wife was being sued for the milk bill! And during the election petition trial he spirited away two witnesses out of the town! On the day of the election Baker had a car, with the Tory colours, carrying voters to the poll. Mr. Justice Channell held that it was as clear a case of agency as could be; but Mr. Justice Grantham thought otherwise, because, as he said, he took a common-sense view of the situation. Archbishop Whately once said that a man could not navigate a ship by common sense; and a Judge should not decide a point of law by common-sense when he had the Statute before him. There were other things to which he might refer, but he thought he had now brought the salient facts before the House. He had intended to show that Mr. Justice Grantham had acted illegally and had upset the judgments of Judges who had preceded him. He had said with great candour that he had never been an election Judge before, and had therefore to look up the judgments of other election Judges, and had come to the conclusion that they were wrong, and he based that on his own recollection of what took place when he was a Member of Parliament. But if anyone quoted *Hansard* in a court of law to show what the intention of an Act of Parliament was he would be told he must construe the Act as it was passed. If ever there was a time when the House of Commons should interfere with the conduct of a Judge this was the time. This was not a mere question of general jurisprudence; it was a question in which every Member of the House was vitally concerned as affecting the purity of elections. Having regard to the fact that a large majority of the whole House signed the memorial, and that the case as disclosed then was infinitely weaker than it was now, he hoped that Members in a matter of domestic concern, vitally affecting their own rights and those of their constituents, would be left to form their own judgment as to what was right without considerations of Party expediency. This was a great occasion, and the House ought to pronounce a judgment which would strike a ringing blow for purity of elections. They owed it not only to themselves, but to those who would come after, to maintain the purity of elections, the honour of Parliament, and the keeping away from the bench as far as they could the animus of Party feeling. He commended the Resolution to the House, and expressed the hope that the God of righteousness, which exalts a nation, and the God of truth, which makes a people free, might guide and direct their decision aright.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter) said that this was in no sense a Party Motion; it was not even a political Motion. It concerned both sides of the House. It was surely necessary for the dignity of Parliament and for the honour of this country that some further inquiry should be made into this matter, and that it should be sifted by a Committee of this House. The duty lay with the House itself. That was recognised by the fact that the Judge reported to Parliament and furnished with his report the whole of the evidence in the case. There could be no reason for his sending these reports to Parliament, unless they were for the purpose of Parliament coming to a decision on the matter. Mr. Justice

Grantham was a political Judge—he made no secret of it. Politics entered into his daily life and his daily sayings on the bench, and in his (Sir George Kekewich's) opinion a political Judge ought not to be trusted to inquire into these petitions. Mr. Justice Grantham was appointed as much for his political as for his legal attainments, and perhaps more so. He did not say for a moment that his decision in the Yarmouth case savoured of corruption, and he did not say that he was not honest, or that he was conscious of any political bias in coming to that decision; but he did say that the political bias was there and that he was affected by it just as he was in the decision he came to at Bodmin. He looked at this case through spectacles of the Tory colour. He (Sir George Kekewich) recognised how difficult it was for Judges to give decisions, especially political decisions, which were not open to objection, but he thought when Judges came upon the Bench politics should go. The summing-up of Mr. Justice Grantham read more like a special pleading for the respondent than anything else. It did not appear to be an exact balance of the evidence for and against, but throughout it betrayed the strongest bias in favour of the respondent. One curious result of this case was that the whole conduct of it rested on Mr. Justice Grantham. Mr. Justice Channell was a mere assessor and had no influence upon the result of the petition. As he understood the law, when judges differed the petition failed. Was it reasonable when men consented to an arbitration they should consent to two arbitrators being appointed without a third in order to settle matters. In this case, so far as he understood, the whole responsibility for the result rested with the senior Judge. The decision of an election petition was the most delicate duty that a Judge could undertake. The Corrupt Practices Act was full of technicalities, and he personally should doubt whether any Member of this House in the course of an election had not quite unintentionally been guilty of the infringement of the provisions of that Act. The two questions before Mr. Justice Grantham with regard to this election petition were with regard to agency and treating. As regarded the question of agency Mr. Justice Channell was quite clear, but his clearness had no weight with Mr. Justice Grantham. So far as the question of treating was concerned there was very little difference between the garden party at Llandydrock and the party at Yarmouth. At the one there was tea and at the other there was whisky. The one took place in September and the other in October, and the one which took place at Yarmouth partook more of the character of an orgy than that which took place at Llandydrock. All these entertainments were bids for popularity on the part of the candidate, and in that respect they did not differ one from the other, although in the case of Bodmin the sitting Member lost his seat, and in the case of Yarmouth he retained it. He thought the difficulties in the present case were due rather to the system than the man, and he hoped that whatever else the inquiry led to, it would lead to some attempt to reform the present system which was calculated to bring the Judges and Parliament into contempt.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House to consider the Report of the proceedings on the trial of the Election Petition for Yarmouth, and the complaints that have been made of the partisan and political character of the conduct during the trial of that Petition of Mr. Justice Grantham."—*Mr. Swift MacNeill.*

*MR. BUCKMASTER (Cambridge) said a debate which openly called in question both the administration of English justice and the character of an English Judge was one upon which no man could enter without feelings of grave uneasiness and distrust, and especially no man who, like himself, had by the daily experience of over twenty years of a busy life learned to regard the example set by the English bench as creating an obligation in respect of which the whole world was our debtor. His plea for an indulgent hearing upon this the first occasion on which he had addressed the House was, therefore, no mere formality. He quite agreed with some of the observations which had fallen from the hon. Member who moved the Resolution. He agreed that it might be unwise and undesirable for the House to abrogate any control over the behaviour of Judges on the Bench. He thought it was eminently desirable that that control should be retained, but could anyone doubt that its interference with regard to the conduct of judicial affairs, unless for some grave reason well approved in the consideration of all its Members, could be productive of nothing but mischief? If every unwise utterance a Judge made, if every foolish and flippant jest, if every exhibition of hot and unseemly temper, was to be made a subject of consideration by this House, the only result could be that they would impair at once the authority of the English Bench and the dignity of the House of Commons. It was therefore essential that before the House resolved upon this matter it should consider and determine the facts on which its resolution should be based; and for that purpose it was necessary to go a little more in detail than the hon. Member who moved the Resolution had done, into the actual facts which called for consideration in the Yarmouth case. The Member for Yarmouth was accepted under the euphemistic expression of "prospective candidate" as early as July, 1904. It was clearly established that during 1904 and part of 1905 ward meetings were held, at which he was present and made political speeches and where drinks were provided for those present free of expense. On October 19th a large meeting was held at the Town Hall, called an "At Home," at which drink flowed to such an extent that several people became intoxicated, and one man unfortunately lost his life. On the day of election it was established beyond dispute that a man called Baker bought voters for 2s. 6d. or 3s. a head, packed them into a cart that flew Tory colours, and delivered them in consignments at the polling booth like cattle at a market. These facts were proved beyond question. But what they had to consider was whether these facts of indisputable corruption were facts for which the present Member for Yarmouth was responsible. Reading the account of this election, one was able to realise the protest made by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn against the Judges having the duty of deciding these matters thrown upon them. He said—

> "Is Her Majesty's Commission to be neglected, the gaols to remain undelivered, and the assizes untried, while Her Majesty's Judges are engaged in the investigation of the unclean matters of a corrupt borough?"

What one had to consider was whether in the investigation of these unclean things, Mr. Justice Grantham, in coming to the conclusion he did, came to a conclusion which they could only attribute to his being improperly influenced by unworthy bias. On careful consideration of all the matters in this case, he respectfully asked leave of the House to say that there was no foundation at all for that conclusion. He said it with the more confidence because he freely admitted that when this matter was first brought to his notice by the newspaper reports alone the conclusion he formed was that this Motion was justified, and if he had retained that opinion, he would now have been speaking in favour of the Resolution. But on going into the details of the Blue-book containing the evidence, he found that the grievances which had so powerfully impressed the hon. Member who moved the Resolution had no foundation. The charges the Judge had to consider were these. First, was there anything which could invalidate this election in the drink given at the ward meetings in 1904; secondly, was the At Home given in October, 1905, corrupt treating within the meaning of the Act; and finally, could the agency of Baker in the corrupt practices of which he was guilty be brought home to the sitting Member for Yarmouth. Upon reading the evidence he would have thought that the most serious matter the sitting Member had to meet was the At Home on October 19th. It was with the greatest possible regret that he found such a meeting as that could be justified. It seemed to him that if the law was to be carried out as here laid down, it called for some very swift and drastic reform; but what they had to consider was whether the law as administered by Mr. Justice Grantham was properly based upon evidence before him. With regard to the gathering on October 19th, Mr. Justice Channell, in a most careful, luminous, and considerate judgment, thought it was not possible upon the evidence to say that there was corrupt treating at that meeting. Mr. Justice Channell dealt with this question first on page 7 of the Report, where he said—

> "If the result of this election in my opinion depended upon it—and it does not, in my opinion depend upon it, because of the reasons I have given as to the agency of Baker—but if it had depended upon it, I think I should have wanted a little more consideration to see whether or not that did not come within the express terms of this Act of Parliament; because it must be remembered what 'corrupt' means. 'Corrupt' means doing the thing which the Legislature forbids, and the question is whether the Legislature had forbidden it. Treating is sometimes defined to be getting at voters through their mouths and through their stomachs—supplying them with food and giving them drink. Now, although on the whole it was a rash thing to do, I do not think that this case is made out."

Was it possible in face of this to say that the learned Judge did not make up his mind upon it? He recognised the difficulty, and how evenly the balance was swung, but thought the balance on the whole was in favour of the view that at this meeting there was not corrupt treating. He said—

> "I think the main object of the entertainment was to get the idea to prevail that Mr. Fell was a good fellow, who would welcome, and who would talk with people in all classes of life just as Sir John had done. I think that was the object, in addition to the object, which I do not leave out, although I do not think it is so very important, that it was also to give Sir John the opportunity of meeting and seeing these people. Then if the refreshment was subsidiary to that, I do not think it is corrupt treating."

On page 8 Mr. Justice Channell said—

> "If I felt bound to come to the conclusion that that entertainment was given for the purpose of getting votes, as is said, through the mouths and stomachs of the people who drank the whisky and tea and ate the bread and butter—if one came to that conclusion as a fact, one would be bound to hold it was corrupt treating within the meaning of the Act of Parliament. But I do not feel bound to come to that conclusion. I only say that it was a risky thing to do—that it is very near the line—and that it is only because I feel able to come to the conclusion that the main object of the entertainment was a different one, that I am able to come to the conclusion that that was not corrupt treating."

He would ask any hon. Member who had heard him read these passages whether it was not perfectly clear that Mr. Justice Channell's judgment was a clear, definite, and distinct judgment that that meeting was not a corrupt practice.

Mr. MACNEILL asked the hon. and learned Gentleman to look at the bottom of page 19.

***Mr. BUCKMASTER** said he would read the observations of Mr. Justice Channell in reply to Mr. Gill to which the hon. Gentleman had referred. The passage was—

> "If one Judge says the case has gone on one ground, and that upon the other three grounds he has the gravest possible doubt—and that is what I said—and if it was not for the opinion I had formed as to bribery, I should have wanted further time to consider whether the treating was made out. I think your client could not have escaped much more narrowly than that."

How could that take away from the statement of the learned Judge—

> "I do not feel bound to come to that conclusion. I only say that it was a risky thing to do—that it is very near the line—and that it is only because I feel able to come to the conclusion that the main object of the entertainment was a different one, that I am able to come to the conclusion that that was not corrupt treating."

It was perfectly clear that in the mind of Mr. Justice Channell it was not corrupt treating. What was left was the question of Baker's agency. In regard to that question, some further facts needed to be added to those read by the hon. Member. To this day no one knew whence the money came which Baker used. Baker was subjected to a heavy fine. Whether it had been paid or not he did not know, but if it had been paid no one knew where the money came from. What they were concerned about, however, was as to whether there was anything in law that could connect the payment with the hon. Member for Yarmouth. It was perfectly possible that the money might have been provided from some outside source. He desired to say in the strongest terms he could express that it was impossible for anybody who read the evidence to say that the present hon. Member for Yarmouth was corruptly responsible for anything that Baker did. If he were responsible at all, it was by reason of a technicality which ought to be most stringently insisted upon in these election controversies, but which, at any rate, ought to be established before a person was made responsible for any improper act. What was the evidence connecting Baker with the hon. Member for Yarmouth? It was not suggested that Baker held any responsible position at all in connection with the Conservative Party at the election. He was most certainly not in any sense the agent of the present sitting Member before the day of the election. The question was whether anything then happened which made him in law the agent. This was what happened. Baker proceeded to bribe in the early morning—he supposed he could not begin too early for his purpose—and he bribed with such freedom and generosity that the knowledge of his action spread over the town. It came to the knowledge of the Liberal agent, who went at once to a Mr. Nutman, the Conservative agent, and said, "There is a man bribing voters to vote for the Conservative candidate; you ought to put a stop to it." Mr. Nutman at 12 o'clock went to Baker and charged him with this matter. Baker stoutly denied it. The hon. Member who moved this Resolution thought Baker's denial ought not to have been accepted. Why? Supposing Baker had not been bribing after all. Reports of such a nature were freely spread about at election time, and many of them were false. Why was not Nutman to accept Baker's denial? Nothing in the evidence suggested that Nutman had any knowledge whatever of Baker's antecedents to denote that he should not accept what he said. Baker stoutly denied that he had bribed, and Nutman did nothing. However anxious or sore hon. Members might be in this matter they must remember that that was the whole of the case connecting Baker's action with the present sitting Member. Would they say that that evidence was so irrefutable, so clear, and so incapable of any other construction that they were bound to hold that one of the Judges could only have been influenced by improper motives in coming to the conclusion he did? That was what hon. Members had to decide, and everyone who voted in favour of this Resolution must answer to his conscience that he had decided that, and decided adversely to the learned Judge. It could not be said that Mr. Justice Grantham acted corruptly simply because he differed from Mr. Justice Channell. They ought not, on evidence so slender, so unsatisfactory, and so misleading, to attribute unfair or improper methods to a man who, after all, had served his country seventeen years and was not in this House to answer for himself. There was the end, so far as he knew, of the evidence relating to the Yarmouth petition, and if the matter stopped there, could anybody say that there was anything on which Mr. Justice Grantham could be attacked? But the hon. Gentleman who moved this Resolution had referred to other matters which he said occurred whilst the petition was being heard and which he considered were more strongly in his favour than the evidence itself. One of those things was the statement with regard to the poster handed to the bench. Everyone must be in a difficulty with regard to that, for there was no information in the Blue-book upon it. There was no shorthand note to which they could refer. They could not possibly reproduce the circumstances under which it was made; but taking the statement as the hon. Gentleman himself had given it, although they might say it was a sorry and a poor jest to have made, it was impossible to say that it was meant to have any political bearing. It was a miserable thing to dissect this paltry joke, some six months after it was uttered. This joke about the "Birrelling Bill" was said to be one of the remarks which showed bias on the part of Mr. Justice Grantham. Then it was said that the blank which appeared on page 81 of the Blue-book in the remark by Mr. Gill, relative to Walter Belcher, F.C.L.A., had been filled in by the learned judge from the bench. It was by no means easy three months afterwards to speak with absolute certainty as to who the person was who made a particular statement. This statement did not appear in the shorthand notes.

He could only say that these shorthand notes had guided the judgment he had formed, and they were the only trustworthy materials to guide them. Finally, there was the statement made at a dinner by the learned Judge that he had confidence in Sir John Colomb. But Sir John Colomb's conduct was not in question in this petition. When a man went on the Bench he was not expected to leave his friendships behind him; and he saw no harm in Mr. Justice Grantham's expressing his friendship for Sir John Colomb. The learned Judge might have made foolish observations—he had never contended that he was wise in all he said—but the point was whether he had been influenced by political bias to give an improper and unjust judgment in this case. He was quite unable to follow the refinements of hon. Members who seemed to think that it was not corrupt for a Judge to decide contrary to justice in order to promote his own political views. If that was not the point then there was absolutely nothing in this charge. If Judge Grantham had not decided corruptly then there was nothing in this Motion, and they were only wasting time in its discussion. He approached the Bodmin petition with the greatest feelings of misgiving, because there was no trustworthy information before the House upon which they could base an opinion of what took place. Moreover, he greatly regretted the unfortunate circumstance that had deprived the House of the presence of Mr. Agar-Robartes. That regret was very keenly felt, and he was afraid of the result of that feeling when they were attempting to form an impartial judgment of the circumstances. [" Oh."] They had also to reckon with the fact that at Yarmouth one of the Opposition seats was retained, while at Bodmin a supporter of the Government was taken away. That made it difficult for them to be sure they were not looking at the matter through eyes that were not only obscured, but also inflamed by the bitter dust of Party strife. [" Hear, hear," and " No."] The hon. Member for South Donegal complained of Mr. Justice Grantham's throwing over cartloads of authorities upon the question when the election expenses were first incurred. But he did that before the question of the tea party came before him, and he did it in favour of the unseated candidate. How, then, could it be said that he was prompted by political bias? Because he might have been mistaken in his law, was the House of Commons to pass a Resolution which would have the effect of branding him in the eyes of the public as an unjust and corrupt Judge? It was possible that the distinction between the two petitions was precisely that distinction which Mr. Justice Channell referred to in his judgment, when he said—

> "If the food and drink were subsidiary to the object of the entertainment and if the object of the entertainment was not to promote the candidature, it was not a corrupt practice; but if the object of the entertainment was to promote the candidature, and the food and drink were given as ancillary to that, it was a corrupt practice."

It was one of those technical points on which one man escaped while the other was punished. If they had the evidence before them in regard to Bodmin, they might find nothing which would enable them to say that, because of what happened at Bodmin, therefore the Yarmouth petition was improperly and unfairly decided. It might be suggested that he was a member of the same profession as Mr. Justice Grantham. [" Hear, hear."] Hon. Members cheered that statement. Were hon. Members so certain of their own judgment that when there were two motives to which a man's action could be assigned, they always felt right in attributing the one which was the less worthy? He held no brief for Mr. Justice Grantham. If he had not read the Blue-book he should have been supporting the Resolution. He had never spoken to Mr. Justice Grantham in his life, and he had never met him. He was not concerned for the man, but he was concerned for the great system which he represented. It seemed to him that the strength of our nation did not depend only on the strength of our Governments; it depended far more upon the zeal, the fearlessness, and the efficiency with which our public servants in all parts of our vast dominions administered the affairs of the State. It was because he believed that our Judges, who were the chief of those servants, had through many centuries built up a great tradition of English justice that he regarded this Resolution with the uneasiness that he had expressed. He was sure that hon. Members would, at least, remember that, though there might be failings—and, if it were true that a high standard on the judicial bench must always be maintained, failings must occur, for the standard must be low if all men always reached it—yet, notwithstanding all mistakes, he confidently asserted that our great system of English justice was one that commanded the respect and confidence of all people throughout the whole civilised world wherever the English language or the English law was known. It was because he believed that this Resolution, if it were passed, would give a check to that system ["No" and "Hear, hear"], by singling out for attack a man who, as he submitted, had been guilty of nothing but folly—["Agreed"] —he never said otherwise; he had never said that all the utterances of Mr. Justice Grantham were utterances of wisdom, but it did not follow that they were not sound law. It was because he believed the effect of this Resolution would be to attack that system whose honour, next to the honour of this House, he prized most highly, this he trusted all hon. Members would resist it.

Mr. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.) said he could not help feeling that his hon. and learned friend mistook the purpose of this Motion. They were not reviewing Mr. Justice Grantham's decision. Much less were they condemning him there and then. They were asking for an inquiry in order that they might have some explanations of what at present undoubtedly puzzled the mind of the community. He agreed with his hon. friend that there was a serious responsibility connected with the Motion. Lord Palmerston had laid it down in accordance with precedent and in language which he thought the House would be ready to accept that—

> "nothing could be more injurious to the administration of justice than that the House of Commons should take upon itself the duties of a Court of review of the proceedings of an ordinary Court of law. It should only interfere in cases of such gross perversion of the law either through intention, corruption or incapacity as makes it necessary for the House to exercise the power vested in it of advising the Crown for the removal of the Judge."

He did not suggest that the mistakes in this case were intentional. Much less were they, in the ordinary sense of the word, corrupt. The question was—Had there been such a gross perversion of the law, a *prima facie* case of that, as entitled the House to demand an inquiry and explanation? He admitted, with his hon. and learned friend, that a Judge ought to have a commanding position; but another thing a Judge equally needed was the confidence of the public. If the public confidence went, the Judge's usefulness would be at an end. If the public confidence was shaken there was an occasion for inquiry. The question now was, had the public confidence been shaken? He had studied all the cases that had been before the House, and this instance was unique in this particular, that more than half the House of Commons petitioned for the inquiry. That was a fact that they could not disregard. The question was whether there should be an inquiry now. His hon. friend had only given them a sketch of what took place at Yarmouth, but had public confidence been justified? In the first place Yarmouth was exceptional in the respect that political meetings were held in public-houses: no less than twenty-six meetings were held in public-houses. Sometimes those meetings were attended by 100 persons. The chairman's duty was to treat every man who came to free drinks and cigars. In the second place, it was the chairman's duty to introduce the candidate. There was not the least doubt from the evidence what the purpose of these meetings was. One of the most prominent Conservatives in Yarmouth Colonel Driver, said—

> "Through the ward association they could get hold of the men who voted haphazard and would be able to teach them something of Imperial policy and how to exercise their votes."

No less than twenty-six of those meetings were held in public-houses during the course of the campaign, and they were held under protest from the Liberals. He would quote from the evidence to show how this protest was treated. Mr. Sudbury (Question 3279) said—

> "Since Liberals objected to the Conservatives meeting in public-houses, and grudged

them having a glass of beer, the Liberals might suck their acid-drops or a little gin out of a bottle in their schoolrooms."

And how did Mr. Justice Grantham treat this state of things—this was a matter of some importance. Instead of animadverting upon the practice of holding meetings in public-houses he said—

"You cannot get a certain class of people to come to hear you unless—well, as one of the witnesses put it—'I never sit dry in a public-house.' There is a danger I agree, and by all means get them to come and not go to the public-house. But if you cannot I do not think that you are to to blame."

That meant, "Conduct the election without introducing the meetings by free drinks and cigars, by all means, but, if you cannot do that, then give them free drinks and cigars." If a man could not get into the House of Commons without treating the electors to free drinks and cigars then he had better stay out of it. Not only did they have meetings in public-houses but meetings were held in large halls at which drink and cigarettes followed. They were attended by between 400 and 700 persons and drinks again went round. With regard to bribery, fifteen men received sums varying from 1s. to 5s., the average being 2s. 6d. This was done by a man named Baker who was taking voters to the poll all day. At the time Baker was doing all this he was a bankrupt dependent upon £2 10s. a week on the ground that it was due to his wife. How did Mr. Justice Grantham treat Baker? He first of all speculated through a column of the report as to whether this was not what he called a "plant" by the Liberals, without one word to justify his remark. Then he went on to say that Baker was —

"a self-constituted enthusiast who gave—poor persons, nearly all of them of the unemployed class, 2s. 6d.

But Baker was convicted not for charity, but for bribery. It was the accumulation of such points as these that made up the case. The hon. Member had alluded to the placard which was posted at Yarmouth, but he had not read it. This was what was placarded all over Yarmouth by the senior magistrate of Yarmouth—

"Bribery. It is said that bribery is rampant here in Yarmouth. If it is so, who is to blame? Why, those who find the money. What, then, should the voter do? Well, he should take the bribe or bribes offered to him, and then vote as he pleased. If asked how he voted, he should say, 'for your man.' 'The moral law,' says Archdeacon Paley, 'is that a lie may be told to him who has no right to to know the truth.'"

One would have thought that was a case calling for a judicial remonstrance, but how did Mr. Justice Grantham treat it? Here were his words—

"Yarmouth, as a whole, has purified itself from the evil character for corruption it had once possessed."

H thought he put it moderately when he said that it was disquieting to the public to have a Judge going out of his way, in these circumstances, to compliment Yarmouth on its purity. Another matter that gave him trouble and justified inquiry was that Mr. Justice Grantham disregarded authority to an unconstitutional extent. It had been laid down since 1892 in the decision of a most eminent Judge that, from about the time when a man became generally known as a candidate, he must begin to account for his expenses. Mr. Justice Grantham had resisted the train of current decisions. Again, nothing was more firmly established in courts of law than that it was illegitimate to refer even to the history of an Act of Parliament, yet Mr. Justice Grantham referred to the history of the Corrupt Practices Act in the House of Commons, and in point of fact was wrong in his reference to its history. In giving his recollection of what took place in the House of Commons he said—

"One of the most acute and best electioneers of the day, Sir H. James, brought in the Bill because of the great expense he and others had incurred at the elections."

In point of fact the recollection of Mr. Justice Grantham was not only wrong, but he had misquoted Sir Henry James whose actual words were—

"When the summer and autumn of 1880 had passed . . . it was found that corruption had been applied to that portion of the constituencies . . . which had been lately enfranchised, and whose poverty rendered them an easy object to those who wished to corrupt. There was a general feeling that some steps must be taken to prevent the spread of corruption at elections. . . Another evil almost as great in its effects as the evil of direct corruption, viz.—increasing expenditure . . . . ."

It was not the intention of that Act that candidates should be protected against a corrupt constituency, but that a corrupt constituency should be protected against a candidate. The Act was passed to prevent free drinks in public-houses, free entertainments in public halls, and free invitations to casual labourers, fish hawkers, and others. That was why the Corrupt Practices Act was introduced, and if these things were allowed to go on the Act might as well never have been passed. On the top of all this there came the Bodmin petition. He believed that the Bodmin petition was not now before the House, and Mr. Justice Grantham was entitled to the benefit of that technicality. But he doubted whether Mr. Justice Grantham would care to have the case put on that narrow basis. They knew what was said at Bodmin and at Yarmouth, and he would quote the passages in order that they might have them in mind in dealing with the case. At Yarmouth, referring to the Town Hall entertainment given to 700 people on 25th October, Mr. Justice Grantham said—

> "Why should it not have been held? I fail to see. If it had been held during an election, I quite agree the circumstances would have been entirely different. But at that time there was no idea of an imminent election."

Then at Bodmin, dealing with the garden party which took place in September, Mr. Justice Grantham said—

> "As to the garden party, how any sane person could give advice to the father and mother of the candidate to hold such an entertainment on the eve of an election passed his comprehension."

That was to say, that half-past six on December 24th was on the eve of Christmas Day, but that at half-past nine Christmas was not imminent. These two decisions could not stand together without explanation. It was only inquiry which was asked. No one would be more delighted than he or the mover of the Motion would be if Mr. Justice Grantham could give such an explanation as would restore public confidence. He thought his hon. friend was justified in bringing forward the Motion, and he should support the demand for inquiry.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): No one can have listened to this most interesting debate without feeling that my hon. friend was quite justified in introducing his subject for discussion. He has pointed out the widespread interest which has been taken in the Yarmouth election petition, and the public apprehension lest certain views of election law which were there expressed should seriously endanger the purity of elections held throughout the United Kingdom. He has raised grounds for seriously questioning the judicial impartiality of one of His Majesty's Judges, and these are the materials which have in the past afforded, and which I trust will in the future afford, ample justification for the largest measure of criticism in the House of Commons. Several Parliamentary authorities have restricted very closely the action of the House in regard to occupants of the judicial bench, but they have always insisted that the range of criticism should be unrestricted, and that the members of this House were just as entitled to call in question utterances and actions on the part of His Majesty's Judges as to deal with the conduct of any other servants of the Crown. I rather demur to one passage in the admirable speech of my hon. friend behind me, because he rather intimated that this Motion could be treated as a Motion for inquiry. My hon. friend the Member for South Donegal did not so define it; he is too good a constitutional lawyer not to know that there is no minor course which the House in regard to these questions can pursue. We are entitled, as a body, to petition the Crown for the removal of a Judge, but there are the very strongest reasons against seeking to inflict any minor penalty. There are the strongest arguments against censuring a Judge and yet leaving him to occupy his position—against calling upon any member of the judicial bench to continue to discharge under a cloud of Parliamentary censure the most important functions which devolve upon him. And if necessary to support that proposition, I could appeal to the *dicta* of a series of leaders of the House during the last three or four generations, commencing with Mr. Canning in 1825, and embracing Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Gladstone, and, on a minor plane, the late Lord Chief Justice Coleridge when Attorney-General. I do not think the proposition will be challenged. My hon. friend boldly took his stand upon a submission which, if it can be established, amply justifies this Motion. He said that he laid before the House grounds which, if *prima facie* proved—and he gave *prima facie* evidence—warranted an Address being presented to the Crown for the removal of Mr. Justice Grantham. He admitted this was the first constitutional step in a course which must end in that result. Therefore we have to face this Motion under a deep sense of responsibility. The House has to realise, not that the matter is one of public interest which may be further investigated and discussed, but that they must either support this Motion or resist it as they believe or do not believe that Mr. Justice Grantham's conduct is such as to warrant the extreme penalty which can be inflicted upon any person occupying a position upon the judicial bench. If that is so, it is very important to the House to know what is the standard, what is the measure by which his conduct must be judged; and I am sure the House will expect from me some little guidance afforded by the opinions of leaders of great Parliamentary authority and influence in the past who have been called upon to discuss this question. I think they will find that throughout the course of a series of *dicta* prescribing the circumstances under which this penalty may be inflicted, there is the recognition of one pervading and important principle—namely, that this House will not inflict the penalty except for some defect of moral quality on the part of the learned Judge. There must be a moral element present in the misconduct or misbehaviour which is charged; and if that moral element be absent, however much the House may deplore the conduct, however unfortunate they may think it, however much it may violate every canon of judicial demeanour, taste and discretion, yet the occasion is not such as to demand the infliction of this very extreme punishment. Let me ask the House to listen for a moment or two while I establish that proposition. First, what was said by Sir Robert Peel in 1834 as to the conduct of Baron Smith, an Irish Judge brought before the House by Daniel O'Connell. Sir Robert Peel said that to warrant a Motion for the removal of a Judge it was clear that there must be "corruption, partisanship, intentional moral delinquency." I understand partisanship to mean a conscious partiality perverting justice, a partiality leading the Judge to be disloyal even to his own honest convictions. I understand it to mean that the Judge knows that justice demands that he should take one course but that his political alliance, or political sympathies, may be such that he deliberately chooses to adopt the other. In such a case the moral element undoubtedly enters into the definition of misconduct, and cannot be excluded. Again, we find that Lord John Russell, in 1843, in the case of Lord Abinger, which was discussed in this House, said that the—

> "independence of Judges is so sacred that nothing but the most imperious necessity should induce the House to adopt a course that might tend to weaken their standing or endanger their authority."

In the course of the same debate Sir James Graham, a most eminent master of constitutional law and practice, said he had no objection to the question being discussed, but it was—

> "due to the cause of justice itself to defend the Judges of the land, unless we shall be satisfied that their conduct has been corrupt, and their motives dishonest. It is only fair to a Judge, considering his eminent station, the great power with which he is entrusted, and the grave responsibility under which he acts, that the House should not adopt such a Motion as this, unless in our deliberate judgment we are satisfied that there has been manifested on the part of the Judge, who is the object of it, a badness of heart, and a corrupt intention, which have contributed to the perversion of his judgment."

Lord Palmerston in 1856, in resisting the Motion in the case of Mr. Justice Torrens, said that—

> "nothing could be more injurious to the administration of justice than that the House of Commons should take upon itself the duties of a court of review of the proceedings of the ordinary Courts of Law, because it must be plain to the commonest understanding that they were totally incompetent to the discharge of such functions."

He therefore urged the mover, Mr. Phillimore, not to press his Motion to a division, and that Gentleman complied with his request. Lord Palmerston a little further on in his speech said that to constitute misconduct justifying the removal of a Judge there must be—

> "gross perversion of justice by corruption, intention, or incapacity."

By "incapacity" I think Lord Palmerston had in his mind physical incapacity, not mere aberration, not mere error in the exercise of the judicial function, but the incapacity of a Judge who continues so long on the Bench that he is physically unable to discharge his duties. Therefore I think I have made it clear that my hon. and learned friend, in order to succeed with this Motion, must carry the charge home to the point of *prima facie* proof of moral delinquency or obliquity on the part of the Judge. [An Hon. Member: "Or mental."] Or mental, in the sense that it amounts to misconduct in the ordinary acceptation of that term. A Judge's patent is during good behaviour. No Court of law could displace a Judge by any proceeding except by the invalidating of his patent; and to do that it would be necessary to prove that he has been guilty of misbehaviour, and that involves an allegation of misconduct in the moral sense of the term. Has that standard been established satisfactorily in this case? The charge which my hon. and learned friend makes is the charge of partiality. He says that the learned Judge was so influenced by his anxiety to serve one of the political parties that he intentionally disregarded the plain dictates of justice in order to accomplish that end. If my learned friend proved that case the House would, without the smallest hesitation, extend its support to the Motion. But if he has not proved that case, what alternative has he laid before us? We cannot adopt what Mr. Gladstone once called the infliction of the minor penalty of censure; because such a course would leave the learned Judge in the occupation of his eminent position, but discredited and disgraced in his administration of justice by the censure of the House of Commons. Therefore, unless we are thoroughly satisfied that the charge of partiality has been *prima facie* established, however strongly we may condemn the action of the Judge, however deplorable we may regard it, there is no course open to us except that of opposing the Motion.

Let me point out what I understand to be the main grounds upon which the allegation is made. As I proceed I shall criticise the Judge with frankness and freedom. I feel a great difficulty in approaching this task, on account of my long years of professional association with the Judge. But it is a task from which I cannot shrink, which I cannot hand on to another; and I should fail in my obligation to the House if I did not state frankly my opinion in regard to the different topics to which my hon. and learned friend has invited our attention. The first charge which my hon. and learned friend makes is that the political opinions of the Judge were so manifested upon the Bench that it became obvious to those in Court on which side his political sympathies, if not his political alliance, were to be found. It is hard not to say that the utterances of the Judge are open to that construction. If they do bear such a construction, all I can say is that such utterances violated the best traditions of the English bench. I remember how Lord Justice A. L. Smith, a man of the strongest Conservative opinions in private life, a most admirable and learned Judge, declaimed with indignation in Court against the attempt of counsel to introduce some political allusion with a view to influencing the jury. "Politics," said the Judge, "have no place in a British Court of law." In the trial of an election petition the sphere is especially unfortunate for the display of any political feeling on the part of the Judge, which, though it did not influence his decision, and, as I believe, might not ultimately influence his decision, yet would lead persons present who had not the advantages of the Judge's personal acquaintance to the conclusion that he was biassed in regard to political issues, and thus shake that confidence which all should feel in the perfect impartiality with which he discharged his functions. It is all-important not only that a Judge should be impartial, but that he should seem impartial, that he should not merely be actuated by those principles of justice which he is called upon to administer, but that in the public estimation he should be credited with possessing them. I therefore think the action of the learned Judge was most unfortunate. It may have been due, and probably was due, to thoughtlessness; and no doubt if the learned Judge had clear to his mind the inference that would be drawn from them he would have restrained himself from making these observations. We have been given a few specimens of his jokes. Judicial humour proverbially occupies a very low place in the classification of wit. Its scintillations gain immensely by their setting and surroundings. They are emanations from a superior sphere, and are accepted and enjoyed and condoned by those who are compelled to listen to them. They are very seldom enjoyed by both parties to a cause. The wit is generally exercised at the expense of the party, or the witnesses of the party, who is supposed at the time not to have the favourable consideration of the Court. Let me beg the House not to attach too much importance to a judicial joke. The temptation to make it must be so overwhelming that the graver construction that might be attached to it probably never presents itself to the mind of the learned Judge who makes it. But while I would beg the House not to criticise the joke too closely, I must say that it is most unfortunate that the humour should be characterised by an inclination or feeling in favour of the sitting member and against the petitioner. It is difficult to present a petition in an election Court where you are seeking to vacate a seat after a popular election. The whole feeling of the town is against the petitioner. The Court blazes with the colours of political opponents. Ladies smile on the scene from the gallery. If the Judge does not restrain but rather encourages these manifestations of partisanship by observations of this sort, he makes it exceedingly difficult for any petitioner to establish his case, and he throws the greatest obstacle in the way of eliciting the truth from the witnesses. I am not here to excuse or defend what I think was from many points of view deplorable, and what certainly has led to a very grave inference affecting the judicial impartiality of the learned Judge. And now I come to what is the worst feature of the case. The learned Judge was entertained by the Mayor at a banquet, and, unfortunately, made a speech in regard to the election petition. As I understand it, the evidence for the petitioner had not concluded, and next morning it was proposed to discuss seriously the inferences that were to be drawn from the entertainment given by the hon. Gentleman who is Member for the borough. The whole petition rested on the character of that entertainment. It was the main ground on which the petitioner sought to challenge the seat. As I gather, the learned Judge rose and made a reference to that entertainment which could only be construed into disparaging and turning into ridicule the petitioner's case. The entertainment in question had been described as an orgy—perhaps a little highly coloured and too graphic a description; but the learned Judge, as everybody present felt, clearly indicated that he had already made up his mind that there was absolutely nothing in the petition, and had satisfied himself that there was very little to be said in support of the case. Well, I am asked the question—Is that to be justified? I do not suppose there is a Member in the House who will justify it. No one will say it was a wise or that it was not an injudicious speech; but the very openness, the frankness, and candour of it shows that the learned Judge was not acting with any conscious intention to pervert the evidence. ["Oh."] If he had been influenced by a wish to pervert the evidence, disregarding all considerations which would lead him in favour of the petition, do you suppose that he would have laid the foundation for such a charge by the unwisdom of such a frank, spontaneous, and unconsidered utterance? When you wish to ascertain the moral quality of that speech, the whole conduct of the Judge shows that it was due to lack of realisation of the situation, and was not due to conscious intentional partiality. ["Oh."] I am not going to defend it. But I cannot conceive anyone getting up and saying that he believed it was a designed and intentional utterance with a view to bring about the result which it is alleged he wished to accomplish, although as an indiscretion I think it is strongly to be condemned and deplored. It was a postprandial utterance, but I do not justify it upon that ground. I have heard in this House apologies for speeches made after dinner. It is possible that the learned Judge forgot for the moment the occasion on which he was making it. ["Oh."] I say that is a most deplorable and unfortunate feature, but when we come to consider whether it is moral misconduct I confess I cannot come to that conclusion. [" Oh."] This House is not a Court of law or a Court of appeal, although I think it would be highly desirable that some Court of appeal were organised to review these decisions. The learned Judge is said to have remarked that popularity could be legitimately purchased by treating, and he drew a distinction between treating for popularity and treating with a view to securing votes. The distinction, to my mind, carries no difference.

MR. PAUL: Did he draw such a distinction at Bodmin ?

*SIR JOHN WALTON: I was going to say I think he did. The learned Judge took the view that the hon. Member for Yarmouth in giving that entertainment wished to make the acquaintance of the people whom he desired to elect him—in other words, to gain popularity. At Bodmin the popularity was not needed, because Mr. Agar-Robartes and his family were long resident and well known. So that explanation could not be adduced; and therefore the inference was drawn that the Bodmin entertainment was given with the object of obtaining votes and not merely to obtain popularity. With regard to the justification of political gatherings in public-houses; if every public-house is to be turned into a political symposium where politics are to be discussed, with the accompaniment of cigars and drinks, what hope is there of maintaining the purity of elections ? Yet the learned Judge apparently holds these views because he avows them with the utmost frankness, apparently honestly holds them and challenges contradiction of them, and then, when faced with what his learned brother described as a cart-load of authority, he upsets that cart-load because it conflicts with his view of the law. His reason is that in election law precedent does not apply as it does in other departments of jurisprudence, and that a Judge for the time being is quite entitled to take his own view and to enforce that view by reference to his own Parliamentary experience. That may be an unfortunate and erroneous opinion from a legal standpoint. It is a view which may be and would be open to judicial review if there were any Court of appeal—and there is no member of the Bench who has had more experience of the painful results of judicial review than the learned Judge. The House, should they deal with this matter in its legal bearings, would take it out of the true sphere in which it ought to be discussed. The legal opinions expressed by the learned Judge might be criticised and condemned by a Court of appeal, but unless they can be carried a long way past the stage of unwisdom and indiscretion into the sphere of moral delinquency, I submit you do not get a proper ground for supporting this Motion. A word about the Bodmin case. Although it is difficult to reconcile the judicial rule framed at Yarmouth with its application to the case at Bodmin, I submit there are grounds which may lead the House to the conclusion that the learned Judge did honestly distinguish between the two cases. In the first place, I think both sides agree with the decision at Bodmin. I think both sides agree that, after the evidence of what was illegal treating in the eyes of the law, the seat was properly vacated. You have the decision in the case of Yarmouth supported, not for the same reasons, but in its result and conclusions that the treating was not corrupt, by the highly efficient, by the extremely high-minded and judicial opinion of Mr. Justice Channell, and, therefore, I feel that no inference can be drawn from a comparison of this case with that of Bodmin. In the Bodmin case the Court was largely relieved from the necessity of drawing the inference which they were compelled to draw at Yarmouth. The question was not, was there treating ? There was undoubtedly treating. The question was, Was that treating corrupt ? And the Court has to draw an inference as to intention. In the Yarmouth case it was strongly contested whether or not the entertainment was given in contemplation of the election; and Sir John Colomb and others were called on to say that in their opinion there was no election contemplated within a year. The Member for the borough had expressed a similar opinion. Therefore, although the period of the entertainment was actually nearer to the general election than in the Bodmin case, yet on the evidence there was nothing to show to the satisfaction of the learned Judges that the entertainment was given in contemplation of the general election. That conclusion has been drawn by both these learned Judges. At Bodmin, where possibly the respondent's case was less carefully constructed, it was admitted by the witnesses that they knew that an election was imminent, and at the time the entertainment was given they were conscious of an impending election, but they thought they were sufficiently far off to be within the limits of the law. It was in the face of that admission that the inference of the Judges was drawn. I do not ask the House to say whether the grounds were right or wrong. Probably some hon. friends behind me will say there was not sufficient justification for drawing a different inference in the two cases, and I think I entirely share that opinion. But what I do say is that there are grounds from which you might fairly infer, and from which you ought to infer in the absence of very clear evidence, that, although it is difficult to reconcile those two decisions, you cannot say they are absolutely irreconcilable—that you are driven to the conclusion that there must have been a dishonest mind tampering with the law just as it became convenient to accomplish some end. That is what I have to say, and I am sorry if in saying it some of the expressions I have used have not commended themselves to all sections of the House and to some hon. friends behind me.

Now I come to the issue which I understand the House is called upon to decide. There is no case for inquiry; there is no case for censure; there is no middle course for the consideration of the House. Either you must take the first step—and I cannot conceive that it could be a step that would be reversible or could be reversed—in a course which involves removal from the English Bench of one of His Majesty's Judges who for nearly twenty years has been performing judicial functions, or you are to come to the conclusion that, although you condemn part of his conduct, disapprove of his utterances, or think he may have been guilty of some error of judicial demeanour and judicial discretion, you do not regard the case as one in which such misconduct has been shown to have been committed as the law contemplates, and therefore that this is not a case in which the infliction of the extreme penalty applies.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Make him a peer.

*SIR JOHN WALTON: That is apparently regarded all round as a satisfactory compromise. There is only one instance, only one certainly in modern times (the hon. and learned Member would probably confirm this), in which the House has adopted a motion of this sort. That was in the case of Sir Jonah Barrington in 1828.

MR. MACNEILL interposed to mention the instances of Mr. Justice Johnson and Mr. Justice Fox, against whom proceedings were instituted, but both of whom resigned.

*SIR JOHN WALTON: I think that confirms my impression. I do not think Parliament has ever addressed the Crown for the removal of a Judge except in cases of grave moral misconduct—and Sir Jonah Barrington's case was one of clear malversation and clear moral misconduct—and I think it would be the first time in our history if, for grounds such as are alleged here, on such evidence as has been adduced, this House were to adopt or seek to inflict the extreme penalty. To put it very shortly, I consider that, although the conduct of the learned Judge was open to animadversion and has received and may receive strong animadverson in the course of this debate, the penalty of deprivation is reserved for graver errors than those upon which the hon. Member has relied in support of this Motion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): It would be improper that this debate should come to a conclusion without some expression of opinion from this bench. The House will not be surprised that I should agree with the conclusion at which the Attorney-General has arrived. I think the reasons that he has given for that conclusion are conclusive, although I do not wholly agree with everything that has fallen from him. I am not sure that I have the competence to enter on the criticism of his legal position, but I agree with him so far as I am capable of understanding that aspect of the question. With the general inferences he has drawn upon the case and with the advice he has given to this House I am myself in entire harmony. The learned Gentleman has commented upon the *obiter dicta* of Mr Justice Grantham from the Bench in the course of the trial, and, in terms more severe, upon the speech he is alleged to have made at some entertainment given not to him alone, or to one Party alone, but by a Radical mayor to the two Judges trying the case, to the counsel on both sides, and, as I understand it, to persons belonging to both Parties. The Attorney-General takes a graver view of the indiscretions of the learned Judge on that occasion than I am disposed to take. He is very lenient to the judicial wit and rather severe upon the post-prandial wit. I do not know that, read in cold blood, either the one or the other would add much to our amusement or edification. Judicial wit has not many admirers in this House. I am not sure that if we had the opinion of the Judges on the House of Commons wit we should find that much more favourable; and I tremble to think what would be the opinion expressed on this House could we conceive a meeting of His Majesty's Judges at which there would be free debate and free comment on the episodes which day by day occur within these walls, which even within these walls do not command universal admiration, and which, in the language used of these Judges by some one in the House to-day, do not greatly add to the dignity, credit, honour, or authority of the House. If we are fallible here, if there are lapses within these walls, we must not be too rigorous in our criticism of similar lapses elsewhere. But in truth it seems to me that you can hardly listen to the accounts given by the learned Members who opened these proceedings of the Radical dinner to all sides in the case without seeing that these much commented on observations were very unhappy specimens no doubt of that kind of humour which many of us are driven much against our will to produce on these occasions, and which—I am sure I speak to a sympathetic audience—we do not wish to have too severely criticised or too minutely reported in the next day's newspapers. On the legal question, of course, I will not offer an opinion. The Attorney-General, as I thought a little gratuitously, expressed a strong opinion as to the conclusions which the Judge should have arrived at on several controverted points. I am aware that I am not competent to follow in his footsteps; and any opinion of mine on a question of law would be received with deserved contempt by the audience I am addressing. But the chief point in which it is asserted that Mr. Justice Grantham is open to criticism is that he gave a decision at Yarmouth on the subject of treating which was inconsistent with his decision at Bodmin. I would remind the House that both those judgments were unanimous. ["No."] Yes, on that point they were. There was a matter on which the two Judges differed, but that was not the matter of treating. Mr. Justice Channell and Mr. Justice Grantham were agreed upon the treating case at Yarmouth, and Mr. Justice Lawrance and Mr. Justice Grantham were agreed upon the treating case at Bodmin. Does this House feel itself so strong in law and impartiality that, where both Judges were agreed, it will decide that one of the Judges concerned was guilty, not only of incompetence, but of incompetence amounting to corruption? It is impossible to pass censure on a Judge who found another Judge of undoubted impartiality to take the same view. What is the history of that change in the law by which the trial of election petitions was transferred from this House to the Judges? This House recognised that it could not approach these questions of election petitions with the impartiality required to decide them. We recognised that we were a Party Assembly and that it was impossible, we being human after all, that these questions should be decided by a Parliamentary Committee purely on the merits of the case. It has been said, that although a House of Commons Committee may be a partial body, a gentleman who wears his politics on his sleeve to the extent that Mr. Justice Grantham does cannot be regarded as more impartial than a House of Commons Committee. I respectfully suggest that those who say that have drawn very erroneous inferences from the fact. No doubt Mr. Justice Grantham is a gentleman who has always held Conservative opinions, But most of our Judges, from the Lord Chancellor downwards, have at one time of their lives been Members of this House—ardent politicians, and sometimes vehement and intemperate politicians. I am not making a charge against one side rather than the other. But it has never been alien to our judicial system to appoint gentlemen of notoriously strong political opinions to the highest judicial office. That being our practice, we cannot suppose, and none of us do suppose that these Gentlemen divest themselves in their private capacity of the convictions which they have always held, and through which, it may be, they have risen to the judicial Bench. It has often been that distinguished capacity, shown perhaps more in our Party conflicts in this House than in the Courts of law, has raised them to their high position; and we are so familiar with that rule that we rightly accept the view that these gentlemen are capable of divesting themselves of political prejudice when dealing with cases that touch politics. Supposing, *per impossibile*, that some gentleman of strong political opinions were raised to the Bench, and were determined to use his great office to further the interests of one Party. What would occur? Would he make jokes, good or bad, about the Party agents of one side? Would he make after-dinner speeches with a Party bias in connection with a case being tried before him? Would he let it be known to all and sundry that he still held the opinions which he held before being raised to the bench? No, Sir, this hypothetically corrupt Judge would pursue opposite tactics. He would be the last man in the world to utter *obiter dicta* from the Bench, to throw suspicion on his judgments, and to enable them to be caught hold of by critics, to be commented on in this House and in the hostile newspapers. His sinister object and corrupt motives would be concealed under a judicial gravity of demeanour. No joke, good or bad, would escape his lips, and no imprudent speech would he utter which could be brought against him. Nothing is more transparent than Mr. Justice Grantham's honesty in this matter. It never occurs to him that his countrymen could suspect that his action as a Judge would be modified by the fact that he held such and such political opinions. He behaves imprudently, it may be—from his own point of view, and perhaps from all points of view. But no man who had the smallest drop of the poison of corruption in his blood, no man who was really moved by the atrocious intention of using his judicial position to further the interests of a political Party, would act as Mr, Justice Grantham has acted in these recent trials. You must take the man as you find him; and, speaking for myself, and not without some sympathy from Gentlemen who differ from him, I say that a more transparently natural, candid man than Mr. Justice Grantham never exercised judicial functions. And what are we doing now, or, rather, what is the hon. and learned Gentleman asking us to do? He is asking this impartial ond non-Party assembly to constitute itself a Court of appeal upon a Judge who, he alleges, has been influenced by Party motives. I cannot imagine anything more discreditable to this House. If hon. Members will think of the kind of cases in which we criticise our Judges, they will find that they are cases in which the decisions of the Judges have come into collision with some Party interest in this House. There have been three or four cases, and most of them were connected with Party politics. [Mr. MACNEILL: "No."] All those cases quoted by the Attorney-General were connected with the Party politics which we recognised so perverted our judgment that we could not deal with these election petitions ourselves. That fact should make us pause. It has been universally recognised that Parliamentary Committees were deprived of their powers in these cases; and if, whenever a Judge goes against the interest of any section in this House in a manner which gives some handle, however legitimate, to comment and criticism—if that is going to be made a ground for dragging him before this House, and for commenting on his conduct in a manner which Mr. Speaker would never tolerate in ordinary debates then I say that the great reform in our electoral laws which was effected when we transferred the trials of petitions will be found to have done more harm than good. At all events, as long as it was in our hands, we might be the victims of a Party majority, but the evils did not spread beyond this House. We are accustomed to the evils as well as to the benefits of our Party system. But if, as a result of this change, we are to transfer Party feeling from the walls of the Committee rooms and to comment on the Judges of the High Court, then the benefit of what seemed to be a great reform will be more than neutralised. Although I fully recognise that from the first the debate has been conducted on the whole with moderation, and with a great desire not to misuse the opportunity, I confess I look at these debates with the greatest doubt as to whether they will not do infinitely more harm than good. If I had been in the place of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, I own that I should have hesitated to give an opportunity, sadly wanted for other discussions, to bring this debate on. The right hon. Gentleman may have had reasons not known to me for doing so; and I admit that the character of the debate has been in the main not discreditable to this House, if there must be a debate at all. But if the debate is to finish with a vote which is really condemnatory of a Judge of the High Court, manifestly that can only be followed by further discussion as to whether that Judge should not be removed from the Bench. It is impossible, unless we are prepared to take that further step, and to give the remainder of the session to these difficult matters, to accept the Motion of the hon. Member. Supposing we do accept it and supposing the inevitable consequences follow—namely, a vote brought forward not by the Government, because they dissent from it, but by some independent Member, in time given by the Government for a Committee of the whole House appointed to investigate Mr. Justice Grantham's position, are you not going to aim a blow at the administration of justice in this country? I think you are going to administer the severest blow. You are going to constitute yourselves, as I know may sometimes be necessary, the judges of the actions of a Judge, and you are going to choose as the topic on which to criticise his action a topic on which you cannot pretend to be impartial, a topic on which we have transferred our powers to the Judges, and a topic on which political passions will inevitable arise. Under cover of purifying justice and keeping the Bench absolutely apart from any taint of political partiality, you are going to aim a blow at the independence and at the position of the Judges of the High Court, which no possible advantage which you could obtain from it could compensate, and the evils from which would be far-reaching and would make it, I believe, impossible for you to leave the jurisdiction of these election petitions in the hands of the Judges at all. I am sure it would involve a total re-modelling of the whole method of trying election petitions; and that serious enough in itself, would be a small and insignificant element in the general mass of public injury and public evil which you would inflict by hasty and partial commentary on the action of Mr. Justice Grantham.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman attached some blame to me for having given a day for the discussion of this question. I think he forgets the memorial that was presented to me signed by 347 members of this House asking for an opportunity. But even if I had received no such memorial, I conceive that the state of irritation of public feeling in many quarters and the astonishment which prevailed after we had read the accounts of the Yarmouth election trial, would have necessitated the granting of a day for the purpose. I think, further, that the discussion that has taken place to-day amply justifies the devotion of some part of the public time to the purpose. I was glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman recall to the House the circumstances in which the House in 1868 parted with its jurisdiction in the matter of election petitions. These proceedings have led me to ask myself again and again, why was it that the House parted with its jurisdiction if this is what it is to receive for it? The House parted with its jurisdiction because it was conscious that trial by Select Committee of this House was almost farcical in its results. The Members of these Committees were all Party men, the Committees were constituted in such a way that one of the two parties always had a majority, and, therefore, one petition was balanced against the other. Unless there was some flagrant impediment in the way, it was pretty well known the moment the Committee was appointed what its decision would be. It was thought that we must take it out of the atmosphere of Party politics altogether, and that in the interests of purity and of strictness and of legality in elections we should get it into a higher and serener sphere, and for that purpose it was referred to the judges. I venture to say that those who proposed and supported that policy would have hesitated if they had been able to foresee such cases as these. The right hon. Gentleman has admitted that Mr. Justice Grantham is avowedly a Party man. We all know that he is. I had the pleasure of sitting with him in this House. He was one of those most useful of all Party men who come to the rescue of the Government they support when they are unable to find anything new to say for themselves. After doing a good deal of willing service very effectually, he took latterly to another course, that of pin-pricking the Government which he supported, and that was only interrupted by his elevation to the Bench. He was then, as he is to this day, an honest, straightforward, amiable gentleman against whose moral character I am sure no one who knows him would have a word to say. But he is undoubtedly a partisan, and an outspoken and intemperate partisan. I think it was a deplorable mistake on his part not to avoid, as he could have avoided, as others have avoided who were conscious of having partisan feeling, being selected from the rota for the trial of these petitions. It is unnecessary to suppose that he is a dark-minded, sinister man, still maintaining his old opinions and anxious to interpret them in some subterranean way. He is so saturated with Party feeling and prejudice that he cannot help their coming out. Every one who knows him, and who watched all that has happened, knows that that is the *fons et origo*, that is the real cause. That is a very serious fault in any judicial person. The Judicial Bench in this country, and it is one of the greatest blessings we enjoy, has the confidence and support of the whole community, and it is a large factor in securing for us our prosperity and our well-being. But the Judges have the respect of the country because, and in so far as, they respect themselves. When a Judge whose proper function it is to try a case steps down into the lower sphere, and assumes the right to use the position which he occupies and the advantage he possesses of not being answered on the spot to make little partisan speeches, however short and sometimes humorous, or intended to be humorous, he is as open to our criticism as any man in the street. If we think any Judge by such conduct is lowering the dignity of the Bench and is introducing other evils also, it is our duty to express our reprobation of such conduct. Therefore this Motion is not only in order in a Parliamentary sense, but is perfectly justified and perfectly natural in the circumstances. But let us consider where we stand. My hon. friend the Member for South Edinburgh in his admirable speech said that all that was asked for was an inquiry. But, as my learned friend has pointed out and the right hon. Gentleman has shown, a Motion of this sort, if it means anything, means, and ought to be intended to be carried out, the removal of the Judge in question from the Bench. Let that be understood. If this was a mere question of spending a few days in raking up the somewhat unsavoury facts of these petitions, that might be useless, but it might do no great harm. But if this Motion is carried, undoubtedly it means capital punishment. That is the plain English of it. Has Mr. Justice Grantham—and no one more strongly condemns his conduct than I do—done anything, after all, which deserves removal from the Bench, which, as we have been told, has never been applied except for some moral turpitude, malversation, or other crime of that sort against the law? The most that can be said of him is that he has mistaken the dignity of his office, that not only in Court, but out of Court, while he was engaged on this trial, he has used intemperate partisan language, and that he has forgotten, not only that he was a Judge of the High Court, but that he had been sent to try this political issue, and to carry out the intention of Parliament of removing from the trial of election petitions the very suspicion of any political motive. Another thing he forgot was this, that in these observations of the Judge, whether in the course of the trial or at some dinner, where anything he might say would be reported all over the place the next morning, he did something to distort and pervert the course of justice in the Court over which he presided—not intentionally, I agree with my hon. and learned friend. It was because, as I have said, he is so saturated with his political feelings that he cannot resist acting upon them and declaring them. But, after all, that is a great mistake of judgment. It is a matter deserving of condemnation. But, when we go a little further, and it is sought to interpret this Motion as an expression of the House of Commons that the decisions were wrong, and to constitute the House of Commons, as the right hon. Gentleman said, a sort of Court of appeal for the trial of these petitions, I agree that that is not a function for which the House of Commons is well fitted, and I think it would be most disastrous if it undertook the duty of revising the decisions that were given on election petitions. So that, after all, have we not accomplished all that was required by the situation—namely, that there should be this public, and, as far as I can make out, almost universal—in different degrees, of course, but of the same tendency—condemnation or censure of Mr. Justice Grantham's language and action? Have we not, by this discussion, accomplished all that is necessary? Have we not given him such a lesson that he is not likely to repeat these ill-considered actions? And have we not also vindicated the Courts of law, so far as it is our power to do so, from the taint of political prejudice which is brought upon them by these intemperate, ill-considered words on the part of the presiding Judge? I believe that we have accomplished that. This is the first occasion, as far as I know, be it remembered, since the change in the jurisdiction over election petitions, that the action of a Judge in regard to them—[" No."] Well, there was an Irish case, but that was founded on different grounds altogether. I do not say the whole branch of Judicature has been very successful. I have thought for a long time, though I do not see my way to suggest an alternative that would be preferable, that the trials of election petitions are not very satisfactory. But, at any rate, there they are, and we must uphold them until we get something better; and, in the meantime, we have given this proof to-day of the strong feelings that exist against the interposition in such matters of any Party feeling in this flagrant manner. I think by that we have done our duty to the country, but that we are not entitled to go the length my hon. friend asks us to go—namely, to take the first step in a course which must lead to nothing less than the removal of the Judge from the Bench.

Mr. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said he desired to join in the appeal which had been made to the hon. Gentleman opposite to withdraw his Motion. He could conceive of nothing that would be accomplished by the Motion's being carried to a division which had not been accomplished by the debate that had already taken place. If it were pressed, a great many of them would be put into a very difficult position to know which way they should vote, and therefore he hoped the hon. Gentleman would withdraw the Motion.

Sir J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire) thought the discussion which had taken place was sufficient even for so grave a matter. Long ago, on the sage advice of Mr. Disraeli, the House adopted the rule that it would not use its powers to review the reports of the Election Judges, as that would be transferring the ultimate decision from a judicial to a political tribunal. Thus a uniform practice of many years had been established. But this debate disclosed the danger that under the form of inquiry into an Election Judge's conduct his verdict on facts might come under appeal to the House. In this Yarmouth election case the two learned Judges agreed on all points except one, namely, whether the accomplice witness Baker was constructively an agent. On this difficult question the House could not pronounce judgment. Neither was it expedient to make solemn inquiry into supposed judicial jokes, especially when made after dinner and not from the

Bench. The House should remember that, as was said, in Butt *v.* Conant, the Judges and other dignified servants of the Crown have a valuable property in their character and reputation. He hoped the Motion would not be pressed to a division.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.) said he could not go quite as far as the Attorney-General as to say that there must be absolute proof of what the hon. and learned Gentleman called corruption. If they found, as it seemed to be admitted on both sides here, the case of a man who, perfectly honestly in one sense, perfectly frankly in every sense, was so saturated by his politics and his partisanship as that, unconsciously, it perverted his judgment, and reduced the trial to something like a very bad farce, they had a case which might demand the interposition of this House. He agreed with the view that, if they went no further, the proceedings of to-day would yet have done a great work. There had been such a practically unanimous condemnation of the course that had been pursued that he could hardly conceive existing in the mind of any Judge worthy to occupy a place on the English Bench a wish for the retention of office. They found a gentleman whom the House of Commons had, by the voice of its leading men, declared to be so absolutely, so frankly, so honestly perverted and saturated with political feeling and prejudice that he could not keep that feeling and prejudice under during the main business of these election petitions. That was a state of things which, if it were to continue, would be intolerable. His opinion was that the voice of the House of Commons, as expressed in this debate, would render it impossible of continuance. He held that the persistent public exhibition of political partisanship and prejudice in the discharge of official duty might be a reason for the House of Commons to proceed to the extreme sentence, but in this case he thought the severe lesson given by their proceedings to-day would be adequate for the occasion, and a greater effect would be produced on the public mind if his hon. friend withdrew his Motion.

MR. MACNEILL said that in yielding to the appeal of his hon. and learned friend, and in acknowledging the general sense of the House, he felt he should be doing the right thing. Having regard to the universal condemnation of Mr. Justice Grantham's conduct it would be scarcely appropriate to carry the matter further. They had secured a moral and substantial triumph, and he asked leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

TOWN TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [18th May], "That the Bill be committed to the Standing Committee on Law, etc."—(*Mr. McKillop.*)

MR. JOHN REDMOND moved to substitute the Standing Committee on Trade for the Standing Committee on Law. He pointed out that the Standing Committee on Law had a long list of Bills before it, whilst the Standing Committee on Trade was free.

Amendment—

"To leave out the word 'Law,' and insert the word 'Trade,'—(*Mr. John Redmond*)—instead thereof"—

Put, and agreed to.

Main Question, as amended, proposed.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said he desired to raise a question of procedure with regard to Grand Committees. The session had now gone so far that private Bills had no chance of being passed into law without the assistance of the Government. This particular Bill had been before the Grand Committee in the previous session for a considerable time, and therefore if the Motion now before the House received the sanction of the Government, the House ought to be made aware as to whether the Committee was to continue its labours—it was a matter that affected the whole question of business—during the autumn. If the Motion was put forward in order that a private Bill might be got on with, in view of further proceedings, he thought there ought to be a statement from the Government as to the form those further proceedings were to take. It was most undesirable that a Grand Committee should be called upon to consider Bills which, without the assistance of the Government, could not proceed further.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG said that when the Second Reading was discussed in this House, he understood the Chief Secretary to say that there were portions of the Bill which he viewed with favour, whilst there were others which he did not, and that if the Bill had been introduced in something like the form in which it came before the House in the previous year, the Government would have been prepared to support it. The present Bill, however, was totally different from the Bill presented in previous years. The first four clauses of this Bill practically constituted the Bill of last year. There were a number of Members representing the north of Ireland who felt that the section dealing with compensation for improvements ought with certain restrictions to be passed into law; but there were one or two other matters of vital importance which had been introduced. The question of compensation for disturbance was a point with which the Chief Secretary dealt at considerable length on the Second Reading. Under all the circumstances he thought before they decided this question they should have a full statement from the Chief Secretary or the Attorney-General for Ireland as to what exactly the position of the Government was. If the Bill was cut down so as to include only the question of compensation for improvements, he had no doubt it would go through its remaining stages with little trouble, especially if they removed the clause which dealt with the retrospective action of the Bill. He raised this question in order to ascertain what the Government's intentions were with regard to the Bill. He maintained it was not a Bill which should emanate from a private Member, but that the question was one which should be dealt with by a Government measure.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR expressed the opinion that this Motion raised important points of interest which the House should have before its mind in assenting or dissenting to it. The Bill at present was a private Bill. If the Government intended to keep it a private Bill it seemed to him that the House was asked to send a Bill before the Grand Committee which could not result in useful legislation, because private business at this stage of the session had no chance whatever in passing into law. Although his hon. friend professed himself satisfied with the Bill with some modification, he still thought it was a Bill which dealt with issues so great as to make it absolutely impossible that it should be taken without discussion. There were, it was true, peculiarities in Ireland with regard to agricultural holdings which had led to turmoil and to legislation. But the position with regard to town tenants was quite distinct from that of the agricultural tenants. The position of town tenants in Ireland and England was, broadly speaking, the same, and if the Bill were passed it might be taken as the model for future legislation in this country. That being so, this Bill must be controversial and would require a great deal of discussion. If it was a private Bill it could not get that discussion, and it was therefore a mere waste of the labour of the Grand Committee to send it up. It was not as if the Grand Committees had nothing to do, because only the other day they had to transfer a Scottish Bill from one of these Committees to the other because the work was so congested. He took the other possible hypothesis that the Government at this stage intended to make this measure their own, and he was not at all satisfied with that explanation. A Bill which was a Government Bill from its initiation to its close was brought in under certain limitations which insured discussion and prevented hasty legislation. He was not a Member, he believed, of the House when this Bill passed its Second Reading, but he assumed that it passed its Second Reading after a few hours discussion on a Friday afternoon, never having been discussed at its First Reading stage, and it was absurd to say that a Bill dealing with all town property in Ireland should be passed after a few hours debate. Did the Government mean to make the measure their own? If the Government intended to take the Bill out of the category of a private Member's Bill and make it a public Bill, they were bound to give facilities for its satisfactory consideration in the House.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said it would be within the recollection of the House that on the Second Reading of this Bill he and the Chief Secretary addressed the House at considerate length and that he went somewhat into detail with regard to the Bill. He stated that he was strongly in favour of some portions of the Bill and that to other portions of it the Government very strongly objected. Since the Second Reading he had had an opportunity of communicating with the promoters of the Bill; he had had a long conference with them, and the result of that conference was that they had agreed to drop the portions of the Bill to which the Government objected and to modify other portions of the Bill in such a manner that he believed it would be practically non-contentious when it came before the Grand Committee. He thought that the Junior Member for the University of Dublin agreed with his criticisms of the Bill on the Second Reading, and he did not go much further than he (Mr. Cherry) did in stating objections to it. And certainly hon. Members from Ulster took the same view. They were rather more strongly in favour of the Bill, and therefore he did not see why objection should be taken to it now. He might say that the whole of the third portion of the Bill dealing with the enfranchisement of tenancies—which was the most difficult and contentious matter dealt with—the promoters had agreed to drop altogether. As to another portion of the Bill, relating to the setting aside of leases, it had been agreed to abandon that portion. The portion relating to compensation for disturbance it had been agreed to confine to cases where a landlord unreasonably had exercised his right to determine a tenancy. He did not think there would be much opposition to that. [" Oh."] There might possibly be, but at all events that was the only part so far as he knew upon which there would be much controversy in Committee. But the bulk of the Bill related to one single matter and could not take more than an hour or two to discuss. The portion of the Bill dealing with compensation for improvements was one upon which they were all agreed. [" Oh no."] Well, he could not go into small details. He thought the House would agree that if a tenant who had made large improvements to his holding was turned out by his landlord, he ought to get compensation for them. He did not think it would be said that there was no difference as regarded town holdings between English and Scottish practice. They knew that in Ireland a large portion of the improvements were made by the tenants themselves, and in many cases the houses had been built by the tenants. That was not the common practice in England. [" Yes, it is."] As far as he was aware of the facts, it was not the common practice in England for the tenant to erect the house or improve it in any substantial respect. As to the intention of the Government with regard to the Bill, all he could say was that they had the strongest sympathy for the portions of the Bill of which they had said they approved. What their action would be in regard to it after it had passed through Committee must depend upon the state in which it came before the House again. At present, however, they desired that the Bill should proceed.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) said that, as he understood, what the Government proposed to do was to endorse with their approval the portions of the Bill dealing with compensation for improvements, and also to a limited extent those making provision for compensation for disturbance. He desired to know from the Chief Secretary whether the provision with regard to compensation for improvements was or was not to be retrospective.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Those are questions for the Committee.

*MR. SPEAKER: Those are questions that will arise in Committee.

MR. CAMPBELL quite agreed, but his point was this. Before they determined whether it was proper or not to vote for sending this Bill upstairs the

House ought to know what portion of the Bill would remain for discussion. If the Bill went up in an attenuated form and was reduced within very narrow dimensions the House might think that the Grand Committee was the proper place to discuss it. On the other hand, if there were retained within it very large and objectionable provisions the House might think it fair and right that it should be discussed before a Committee of the whole House. With regard to the statement of the hon. and learned Attorney-General, he could not conceive any proposition that would be more contentious than the proposition for any cause or reason to allow tenants of town holdings to obtain compensation for disturbance in addition to compensation for improvements. It was quite fair and just that under certain conditions a tenant who was evicted from his holding in a town should obtain compensation for improvements which had added to the letting value of the holding. As he understood, the proposition was that in addition to that he should be entitled to get compensation for disturbance, and that that was to be confined to cases in which the disturbance had been unreasonable. That opened, of course, a vista of litigation, because there must be a Court in every case to determine whether the disturbance had or had not been reasonable. For the first time it would introduce into the tenancy of houses in towns this principle of compensation for disturbance. The other matter which he regarded as of very great importance was the question whether compensation for improvements was or was not to be made retrospective in its operation. If the Bill was confined to a measure to enable tenants on leaving their holdings to obtain compensation in the future for improvements to be made hereafter which had *bona fide* added to the value of the holdings, he for one would gladly support it. But if they could not get an assurance that the Bill would be so confined so far as the Government could effect that object, he would be opposed to having an important principle of that kind discussed in Grand Committee instead of the usual course being followed of having the Bill discussed before a Committee of the entire House.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London) said the old custom was that no Bill should be sent to a Standing Committee if it was in any way a controversial measure. The object of appointing Standing Committees was that they should deal with the details of Bills upon which there was a general consensus of opinion that they ought to be passed. With regard to this Bill, they did not know whether it remained in the controversial state in which it was introduced into the House or whether it had been modified.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. J. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 255; Noes, 66. (Division List, No. 192).

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert H.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, J. A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Benn, W. (T'wr Hamlets,S.Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Blake, Edward
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs.,Leigh
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce,Rt. Hon. Jas.(Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Caldwell, James
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard K.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.Pancras,W.S.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd

Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dillon, John
Dodd, W. H.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haworth, Arthur .
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Nortan, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Chas. H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, H. L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset E
Torrance, A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wees, Thomas
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHnSir Alex.F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Beach Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles,G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt. Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Coates,E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett,A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis(Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain Jas. (Down, E.)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hay, Hon Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt. Hn.Sir John H.
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Liddell, Henry
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Roberts,S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Saunderson,Rt. Hn. Col. Ed.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F. E.(Liverpool,Walton
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J. G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker,Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Sir William Bull.

Main Question, as amended, put accordingly, and agreed to. Bill committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

NEW BILLS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Bill to make further provision for enforcing discipline in the Church of England, ordered to be brought in by Sir David Brynmor Jones, Mr. Channing, Sir George Kekewich, and Mr. Mallet.

"Bill to make further provision for enforcing discipline in the Church of England," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, July 20th, and to be printed. [Bill 298.]

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS (No. 2) BILL.

Bill to amend the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, ordered to be brought in by Sir Frederick Banbury and Colonel Lockwood.

"Bill to amend the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, November 16th, and to be printed. [Bill 299.]

DOGS PROTECTION (No. 2) BILL.

Bill to prohibit experiments on dogs, ordered to be brought in by Sir Frederick Banbury and Colonel Lockwood.

"Bill to prohibit experiments on dogs," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, November 9th, and to be printed. [Bill 300.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, in respect of the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill: Mr. Ellis Griffith; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Essex.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 3, adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at sixteen minutes after five o'Clock till Monday next.

[*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 9th July, 1906.

EARLDOM OF NORFOLK.

Committee for Privileges met: A witness examined: Council further heard on behalf of the Duke of Norfolk: Council heard in reply on behalf of the claimant, Lord Mowbray: Committee adjourned to Thursday next.

The Lord Kenlis (*M. Headfort*), took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation; Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment).

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Tottenham and Edmonton Gas Bill; Committee (which stands appointed for To-morrow) put off *sine die.*

Dover Harbour (Works, &c.) Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

London and South Western Railway Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill; Cheltenham Gas Bill; Metropolitan Water Board Bill; Peterborough Gas Bill; North East London Railway Bill; Huddersfield Corporation Bill; Cardiff Gas Bill; London County Buildings Bill. Read 3^{a}, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

South Lincolnshire Water Bill. Brought from the Commons. Read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners.

Newtownards Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Manchester Churches Bill [H.L.]; Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Metropolitan Railway Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. Moved, That the order made on March 26th last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after June 19th next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2^{a}; agreed to. Bills read 2^{a} accordingly.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill. Committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. Committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY) BILL.

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*Lord Welby.*)

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, although in form this is a private Bill it is in essence a public Bill, and a public Bill of a very important character. The London County Council is the first municipal body in the kingdom, and its expenditure is by a very long way the first municipal expenditure, and this

Bill affords the only opportunity to your Lordships of passing in review the expenditure of the County Council and their proposed borrowing powers during the year. I am very glad that the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees determined that this Bill should be moved by some one who was responsible for it and who knew its details, because I think your Lordships will all be of opinion that, seeing the large increase of debt and the large increase of expenditure of the County Council, it is very desirable that these matters should be explained to your Lordships in detail.

I must confess that I was a little taken aback when I found that my noble friend had simply moved the Second Reading of the Bill as if it were an ordinary private Bill. Your Lordships probably thought—I certainly did—that a Bill which contemplates giving borrowing powers amounting to more than £12,000,000 deserved some explanation of its details from the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the London County Council, but since my noble friend, who, of course, has perfect discretion in the matter, has elected not to say anything in regard the contents of the Bill, I hope he will at all events favour us with some remarks in reply when the debate on the Bill has closed. In the meantime I must ask your Lordships to pardon me for endeavouring, in perhaps an imperfect manner, to explain the Bill to the House.

Your Lordships will find the contents of the Bill explained in the Schedule. Part I. of the Schedule contains the estimated requirements for capital expenditure by the Council from April 1st, 1906, to September 30th, 1907, a period of eighteen months; and it refers to expenditure incurred under Acts of Parliament which have sanctioned various undertakings, and with regard to which the proceedings of Parliament are now almost purely administrative in allowing the expenditure as it is required from year to year. Part II. of the Schedule—and this is, in my opinion, the most important part—contains the estimated capital requirements upon Bills of the present session, and the amount which is required up to September 30th, 1907. Part III. of the Schedule is a matter of less importance. It deals with sums which may be authorised by the Treasury beyond the amounts limited by the sections of this Bill, a total of £550,000; and Part IV. of the Schedule contains the amounts estimated to be required for loans to other municipalities, with regard to which the London County Council act virtually as bankers. Altogether the Bill confers borrowing powers to the extent of £12,224,000.

I shall occupy your Lordships' attention for a very few moments with regard to Part I. of the Schedule. There are some undertakings of the County Council which have been completed, and which, therefore, of course, do not appear in this Bill, and with regard to which I cannot say whether the expenditure kept within the original estimates or not. There are in this Part a good many other undertakings which either have lately been begun or at all events are not very far advanced, and with regard to which, of course, there is no revised estimate. But with regard to the headings which represent undertakings approaching completion, if your Lordships will follow them down with me you will see that in a considerable number of cases, certainly in the majority of cases, a revised estimate has become necessary. Under heading No. 3, £155,000 has been turned into £180,000; under No. 7, £436,000 has been turned into £447,000; under No. 8, £484,000 has been turned into £535,000; under No. 10, £219,000 has been turned into £414,500; and under No. 13 £4,864,000 has been turned into £5,136,000. That, my Lords, with the one exception of steamboats, ends the record of the undertakings which are approaching completion.

The word steamboats, I am told, has become a sort of melancholy term in London finance. The estimate there of £280,000 has become £304,000, and I do hope and trust that this revised estimate is the last estimate on capital account which Parliament is going to be called upon to sanction. These London steamboats are an extraordinary instance of failure of municipal calculations. I pass from their original cost, which, after all, is not so important.

When we come to their working we have already arrived at this point, that up to the present we have lost one-third—30 per cent.—of the whole capital. I am now taking the estimates of the London County Council, and the estimates which Lord Welby presented to the Council lately. I will not go back to all the prophecies which were made with regard to the future of this undertaking. The matter came before two Committees of Parliament, before whom the most sanguine calculations were laid. The Chairman of the Highways Committee of the London County Council said that in his opinion it was almost certain that in the first year the steamboats would pay the £90,000 which was necessary in order to establish an equilibrium. There was a statement which proceeded from certain trade unions, that 15,000 trade unionists would travel by these steamboats every morning. With regard to that latter statement, the only commentary that it is necessary to make is that, after a brief experience, no steamboats now starts earlier than 8 o'clock in the morning.

In the same way the whole service has been altered. It was originally a service which was to run from Greenwich to Hammersmith, but now it has been abandoned further than Chelsea, and the portion between Chelsea and Hammersmith left to the private company; but it does not go on for the whole year, even over the diminished course. From April 1st to September 31st there is now to be a fifteen minutes service from Greenwich to Chelsea, but from October 1st to March 31st there is to be a twenty minutes service from Greenwich only so far as Blackfriars. Therefore, my Lords, the service has ceased to be what you may call a service up the river. The actual deficit to March 31st last was nearly £51,000; the estimated deficit for this year is £52,000; and I observe that the other day it was pointed out by Lord Welby that in four weeks £11,000 had represented the expense while £5,400 had been the receipts, his only remark upon that being that in his opinion the receipts from the steamboat service for the period referred to showed a fair proportion of the cost of working the steamboats for the year. If that be so now, I leave it to your Lordships to judge for yourselves what will be the result when we get between October 1st and March 31st. Although it is a little thing, yet the number of accidents has been so great in managing these steamers that the cost of insuring them, which was only 35s. per £100 last year, has now been put up by the unfortunate insurance offices to £4.

I think I may now leave that matter and take your Lordships to Part II. of the Schedule. Your Lordships will observe the words in several places "if it becomes law." The expenditure here proposed is in virtue of certain proposals which have been laid before Parliament in Bills, and which have been under the consideration of the two Houses. I speak with same slight knowledge of this matter, because I myself have been sitting for nearly the last fortnight on a Committee which has had before it several of the Bills in this Schedule, and which has considered the London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, and also the London County Council Building Bill. With regard to the Schedule, your Lordships will see that the estimates which appear are not estimates of the whole cost of any improvement. It is merely the Parliamentary estimate of the gross cost which is laid before Parliament—that means, I suppose, for this period of eighteen months up to September 30th, 1907. Taking No. 31, the Tramways and Improvements Bill, the figure which appears there is £643,000 for tramways and £73,000 for street improvements; in all, a total of £716,000. But, of course, your Lordships will not suppose for a moment that that is the cost of the tramways undertakings. The total cost of the tramways undertakings at present in progress is, in round figures, £11,000,000, of which nearly £5,000,000 has been expended up to the present time and £6,100,000 remains to be expended.

The most important tramway laid before us this year was the proposed tramway coming from the other side of Westminster Bridge and going round the Embankment and so crossing over to Blackfriars, and we thought that upon the whole it was a desirable tramway to make. Further, with regard to the tramways as a whole, we thought there was very fair reason to think that in the end they might turn out a successful undertaking. But, at the same time, of course, we felt that great caution was desirable, because the County Council have not half completed their outlay. The Finance Committee of the County Council are of the same opinion. This is what the Finance Committee said—

> "The Finance Committee agree with the Highways Committee that it is desirable to complete this work—"

that is, the whole system of tramways in London, north and south—

> "as soon as possible, but the Council would do well to bear this heavy charge in mind and not to entertain fresh schemes of expenditure, however desirable, until we have met the largest part of this expenditure."

Lord Welby will remember those words. I may say—but this is merely a remark in passing—with regard to the way in which the capital cost of the tramways is made up, it appears that whenever a tramway is to be laid down near which an improvement can be made, the custom has been to make the improvement earlier than would otherwise have been the case. It does not follow, of course, that the improvement would be made for a great many years, but in these circumstances it is made immediately and the cost is divided, generally speaking, in this way: one-third to the tramway, one-third to the improvement, and a considerable portion is found by the borough council in whose district the improvement takes place. I had a Return made out for me by the Controller of the County Council showing the effect of this practice. He mentioned in his evidence before the Committee nineteen cases in which it had been pursued, and made out a Return showing that out of an outlay of £1,056,000, £291,000 had been paid by the local authority, £401,000 through the improvements account of the London County Council, and £364,000 through the tramways account. I merely mention that to show your Lordships on what very favourable terms the capital outlay on tramways is being computed, because, of course, if it were some private company laying these tramways and not the county council, the private company would have to pay the whole of the £1,056,000, or very nearly that amount.

Passing from the tramways I come to the Electric Supply Bill. Your Lordships will see that for the acquisition of land, erection of generating stations laying of mains, etc., etc., a sum of £2,500,000 was the estimate made in the Bill. I thought at first it meant that that was the sum which would be required for this year, and as attention had been called to this by a witness, I asked him whether that was not so, and he replied that it was the total cost of the scheme put foward in the London County Council's Bill in the other House of Parliament. Well, my Lords, all I can say is—and I am speaking with some experience, because I sat for a great many weeks last year on the Administrative Supply Bill, which was a private company's Bill—that I am positive that it is quite impossible to create a satisfactory system of electric supply for London, or anything approaching to a satisfactory system, for less than a sum which may run to from £8,000,000 to £11,000,000. What is the meaning of this estimate of £2,500,000? This Bill has been a matter of very considerable controversy, I believe, in the London County Council, and in November last, when the matter was first taken into consideration, the Finance Committee said that they had no *data* as to the limitation, the scope, or the cost of the scheme and, in fact, that they really had no figures at all to go upon. After a very considerable debate the matter was adjourned in order to enable a Bill to be drawn up which could be fully discussed by the County Council, with the result that this Bill was introduced with this estimate of £2,500,000. It came before the Finance Committee. Let me read to your Lordships what they said of it—

> "We have had before us certain estimates of working costs and the probable growth of demand for electricity, but the figures are at present only of a provisional character, and we are advised that the publication of any estimates at the present stage might prejudice the Council's case before a Committee of Parliament. We are consequently placed in a position of difficulty, because while we feel that the Council ought to have before it some means of judging as to the financial prospects

of the scheme, we are unable for the reasons stated to submit any figures to the Council.

Further on they said—

> "We cannot help thinking that the Council ought, before embarking capital in such an enterprise, to have some further security than it will apparently possess."

And subsequently they said—

> "Whatever conclusion may hereafter be arrived at as to the probable ultimate financial results of such as undertaking as the Council may obtain power to establish, we are of opinion that the Council must face the probability that during the early years the undertaking will show a deficiency which will have to be made good out of the rates, because from its nature some years must elapse before a sufficiently large amount of business can be secured to make the concern profitable."

The final conclusion in the Finance Committee's Report was as follows—

> "In conclusion, and looking to all the circumstances, we are impressed with the fact that financial risks are inseparable from an enterprise of this kind covering so large an area."

The London County Council proposed not only to supply the whole of the county of London, but a number of towns in a variety of counties outside—

> "and that if such risks mature, the burden will fall entirely on the ratepayers of London. Bearing this in mind, we are of opinion that if, on the grounds of general policy, the Council should finally decide to promote the Bill, every endeavour should be made to make arrangements with the existing undertakers for the supply to them by the Council of electrical energy in bulk."

Do your Lordships consider that that is an approval of this scheme by the Finance Committee of the County Council? I should say that it was a series of very serious warnings to the Council as to what they were proposing to embark upon; but, nevertheless, the Council proceeded to vote, and in spite of the fact that Lord Welby, Sir Francis Mowatt, and all the other persons who are chiefly responsible for the finance of the Council went so far as to vote, I think almost for the first time, against their Party, the proposal was carried by sixty-six to thirty-eight, There was not in the Bill one single obligation of any sort or kind on the County Council. There was no obligation to supply electricity to anybody or any corporation; nothing except to proceed by agreement. There was not a single word about any maximum rates or charges, and not one word about charge of any kind or sort. I do not understand why they should put £2,500,000 in the scheme any more than £1,500,000, or any other figure. The object of the Bill was quite clear. I take it in connection with their action in the last session of Parliament. The intention of the Bill was to occupy the ground, to make it impossible for any private company to come in, because once power had been given to them to supply the London area, the result would be that if any private person came forward and proposed to supply even at a much lower rate we should immediately be told, "You must protect your own rates and you cannot allow any competition with the London County Council." I see there is a recommendation that the London County Council should bring this Bill forward again. A year off is a long time, and we do not know what may happen; but if the Bill ever reaches this House I hope the noble Earl at the Table, at all events, will take care that very stringent inquiry is made as to the charges sanctioned, and that there shall be a maximum rate. Moreover, I venture to think that the maximum ought not to exceed ·75 per unit, which was the price at which the company offered last year to supply electricity.

I pass to No. 33—the London County Buildings Bill. Your Lordships will see a sum of £655,000 which appears as the total Parliamentary estimate. It must not be supposed in this case either that this is the total outlay. The total outlay is £1,700,000. That may seem a large sum; but I am giving my own opinion perfectly frankly when I say that it did not seem to me, looking at the whole of the circumstances of the case, that the plan of the London County Council was a bad one, and so far as we on the Committee are concerned, we have recommended your Lordships to approve of it. But this I do say, that when you are laying out nearly £2,000,000 on buildings you ought to be additionally careful as to how you enter upon other costly undertakings, and you ought to consider your finance with reference to your budget as a whole and not simply with regard to the proceedings of independent Committees, every one of whom considers that their own duty and their own sphere is the most important and ought to be attended to whatever may happen to the rest.

With regard to this scheme I have only one remark to make. At the present time I believe there are 1,998 clerks to be provided for, and that within the next two or three years there will be 3,300. I merely suggest to your Lordships that if Parliament entrusts to the London County Council the electric supply of London, and if, in addition, as I see the President of the Local Government Board foreshadows, Parliament also makes the London County Council the body to regulate the traffic of the Metropolis, county councillors will be absolutely unable to fulfil their duties. Indeed, I believe they are not very well able to perform them now, for no less than twenty six are Members of Parliament. How one man can be an efficient member of the London County Council and at the same time efficiently discharge his duties in the House of Commons is beyond my understanding. But if, in addition, they are to have these other duties thrown upon them, then your Lordships will find yourselves called upon before very long to furnish another site, the magnitude of which it is impossible to imagine.

In conclusion, there are one or two remarks which, speaking both from general knowledge and also from experience of the last fortnight, I should like to make with regard to the way in which the London County Council do their business. In the first place I venture to hope that the London County Council will in future go more carefully and more fully into the estimates of undertakings before embarking upon them. That is not my remark; it has been made over and over again by the noble Lord opposite, the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the London County Council, and by the Finance Committee itself. In the next place, I hope the London County Council will pay more attention to Lord Welby and to the Finance Committee than they have hitherto done. The Act constituting the London County Council stated—

> "Every County Council shall from time to time appoint a Finance Committee to regulate and control the finance of the county."

My Lords, how has that enactment been observed by the London County Council? Why, they have disregarded it from the very first. The late Lord Lingen was the first chairman of the Finance Committee, and he suggested that the committee ought to occupy with regard to London County Council finance very much the same sort of position as the Treasury occupies with regard to Imperial finance. The London County Council proceeded to rule that down. They said that it was the duty of the Finance Committee to report to them within reasonable terms, I think the words were, what they ought to do, but they maintained that, having done that, the duty of the Finance Committee was performed, and that it was not in any way the business of the Council to give way to the Finance Committee. The consequence has been that since the establishment of the County Council the Finance Committee has been overridden times without mention.

I go further than that. I see a statement in the preamble of this Bill which appears to me, under the circumstances, rather difficult to justify. It is stated that all the estimates contained in the Schedule to this Bill—

> "have been considered and approved by the Finance Committee of the Council, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1888."

Your Lordships will remember what I read to the House just now from the report of the Finance Committee. Can any person say that that estimate was approved by the Finance Committee? This question has arisen before the Committee upon which I have been sitting during the last fortnight. What the Finance Committee does, as stated by a witness, is this. The Committee never approves of an estimate. What it does is to make remarks. If it absolutely disapproves, then it disapproves. I dare say that may be quite correct, but I do venture to hope that the noble Lord opposite, if he really acquiesces in this, will take a little higher line with his Council and will point out to them the importance of the Act of Parliament. If the Finance Committee report again as they did in this case upon any proposal I hope he will not allow it to appear in the preamble that the estimate has been approved by the Finance Committee. It is to be hoped that in preparing schemes the London County Council will consider them together and not simply on their merits as apart from each other and without any reference to the total amount of their budget. At present there are a set of independent committees. They put forward these measures in the London County Council, debates take place upon them, and they are approved or the reverse, but there is never, so far as I can see, any bringing together of these matters with the total cost which the improvements are going to entail if made. The result is that a very large expenditure is often sanctioned without anyone being distinctly aware of what is being done.

There are a great many things in this world which are desirable. We should all like to have everything perfect, but it is impossible for any corporation or any individual to make all the improvements that are wanted at one time, and what a sensible private person, at all events, does in these matters is to consider the length of his purse and what he can afford, and I think the London County Council would do well to do the same. I will, in conclusion, quote the words of my noble friend Lord Welby, and I do not think I can conclude better than by reading them to your Lordships. The noble Lord said—

"He was very jealous of the credit of the Council, and his jealousy led him to one opinion—that at the present time the Council was in danger of overstraining its credit. They ought to be alive to that danger, as their credit ought to be the first after that of the State, and he could not say that at present it held that position. The large propositions for expenditure which came from various committees showed that the Council was not alive to the danger of overstraining its credit. He wanted to justify the grounds of his statement by a reference to the capital commitments of the Council. During the last few years many millions had been spent on street improvements, involving heavy borrowings. The Strand and Westminster improvements cost £7,000,000. Those schemes would, perhaps, in time provide recoupment of the cost, but for some time the ratepayers had to bear the burden. While he was a zealous adherent of the tramway policy of the Council, and while he believed the time would come when the tramways would pay their way and provide large profits, he could not help saying that the chairman of the Highways Committee, Mr. J. Allen Baker, was an expensive luxury to London, and the millions which he asked for from the money market were, again, a great strain upon the credit of the Council . . . The Council had chosen at that time to commit itself to a work which some time would be perfectly legitimate but not so now—nearly £2,000,000 for a new County Hall, involving another heavy call on the money market. Again, it was likely, in view of the change of Government, that immense schemes like the Port of London Bill might be brought forward at any moment."

And Lord Welby went on to say—

"The policy by which the Council passed scheme after scheme was a strange one. In one year the Council passed a scheme involving huge expenditure, put it aside, forgot all about it, and looked upon it as if the thing were done. The next year fresh schemes were produced, and the process repeated."

It is unnecessary for me to add anything to that; and I have to thank your Lordships for listening so patiently to what I am afraid has been a rather tiresome speech.

LORD WELBY: My Lords, my noble friend has brought a very grave indictment against the finance of the London County Council. He has, I venture to think, somewhat coloured the picture, but at the same time I make no remonstrances on that point. I am only too glad that the finance of a great body like the London County Council should be submitted to review, and I believe a review, if it be a fair review, in Parliament is the best restraint, the best caution, which a large public body like the London County Council can receive. Though my noble friend is perhaps somewhat hard upon the London County Council, I think your Lordships will agree that no critic more competent could be found.

There is one point which I am sure your Lordships will consider with fairness. My noble friend has quoted rather largely from remarks which I have made at different times. May I point out to the House that the Finance Committee of the London County Council is placed in a position of considerable difficulty. My noble friend, comparing small things with great, has pointed out the the Finance Committee of the County Council should occupy something of the same position with regard to the expenditure of the county of London as the Treasury does with regard to the expenditure of the State. But may I call my noble friend's attention to this point, that the Treasury, in its remonstrances with and representations to the other great Departments of the State, makes those remonstrances and representations within closed doors. Any question arising between the Treasury and the great spending Departments is decided by the Cabinet, and the decision goes out to the public as the decision of the Government as a whole. Unfortunately for the Finance Committee of the County Council, we are not in that position. According to the form which the administration of the County Council takes, the different committees present their reports to the Council, and the Finance Committee, either in presenting the estimate or in making their own report, make a representation which is printed in the agenda of the Council, and the warnings and representations which they think it right to make to the Council are thus published to the world. I think your Lordships will, in fairness, admit that that places the Finance Committee of the County Council in a very difficult position if they are really to do their duty in the manner my noble friend thinks they ought, for they have to bear in mind the use that will be made of any remarks they think right to make to the Council. My remarks are made more pointed at the present moment because I am told that in Committees of the other House of Parliament the reports of the Finance Committee have been used freely and largely, not in the way of ordinary criticism, but by interested opponents, by opponents who have legitimate interests against the Council's scheme, to upset the Council's policy. I think your Lordships will admit that I have some justification for bringing before you that difficulty under which the Finance Committee and its chairman work. Your Lordships will notice that in such cases as this the ordinary warnings which the Finance Committee give to the Council are magnified into a representation that the Finance Committee are opposing the Council and entirely disapproving of the policy of the Council. The difficulty which the Finance Committee feel in consequence is extremely great.

Lord Welby.

I remember when the noble Viscount who was lately Chancellor of the Exchequer thought right to point out in Parliament the dangers of the large increase of expenditure. I do not think the noble Viscount would have been at all disposed to do so had it been supposed that in giving such a warning as that he was opposing the finance of the Government of which he was a member, or that he was making it appear that the financial position of the country was unsound. Following somewhat on the same lines, I venture to point out to your Lordships that the Finance Committee, when they bring these questions to the notice of the Council, are not necessarily condemning the policy of the Council or representing to the Council that their finance is in an unsound condition. On the contrary, the proper function of the Finance Committee is to be what has been called the watch-dog of the Council. That is to say, their business is to warn the Council when they think they are entering upon any course in which some restraint is necessary. And here let me say that I agree with my noble friend opposite in many of the remarks he has made. I think it is the business of the Finance Committee to point out when the Council are entering on too large schemes and incurring a large amount of expenditure under too many heads at the same time. It is their duty to impress upon the Council that some prudence, some restraint, in these matters is desirable. In doing that I venture to point out that the Finance Committee are only performing their strict duty, and I do not think that words that may be used in the discharge of that duty ought fairly to be turned against the person whose duty it is to utter them, as if he were condemning or finding fault with the policy of the Council generally.

My noble friend has noticed many points, but on a great many of them I think there is no material difference between us. I cannot entirely agree, however, with his remarks upon the steamboat service. Free comment has been made upon that undertaking for many months past, both inside the Council and by the public, and I for one certainly should not come down to your Lordships to represent that as, up to the present time, a fortunate experiment on the part of the London County Council. At the same time, I would ask your Lordships, in fairness, to remember that we have only the facts of a broken period of ten months before us, and although I cannot say that I am hopeful on the subject, yet at the same time I think that the Council may be fairly granted a longer period than that before it can be said positively that the experiment is of a kind to merit the ridicule which my noble friend poured upon it.

With regard to the next point—the division of the cost of widening streets between the tramways undertaking and the improvements account—I may say that this matter has received and is receiving the attention of the Council. The charging of one-third in the manner in which it has been carried out up to the present has not been thought a just or right division, and the Finance Committee are now engaged with the other committees concerned in endeavouring to lay down principles by which the partition will be made in a more satisfactory manner.

As far as the tramways are concerned, my noble friend did not find fault, I think, with their administration generally or with the results. I would venture to go a little further. From what I have been able to learn, I am most sanguine about the outcome of the tramway undertaking. During the comparatively short time that the tramways have been in our possession a sum of £293,000 has been paid over to the rates; no less than £600,000 has been put aside out of profits to sinking fund; and if you add to that a sum of between £100,000 and £200,000 for depreciation, and bear in mind that every expense that can fairly be put against the undertaking has been paid off, I do not think that the critics of the County Council act fairly if they represent that that is in any respect a failure. Your Lordships are generally somewhat suspicious of what I may call municipal trading. As far as the London County Council are concerned, putting aside for one moment the steamboat experiment, the Council have never undertaken more than two experiments—one is the tramways, about which I have just given the results, and they are not, I think, results of which the County Council need be ashamed; and the other experiment is in connection with the housing of the working classes.

The housing problem has been taken up as a one of the first duties of the country by every class and every section of the community. In dealing with it the London County Council laid down as a precedent condition that they would undertake no scheme for re-housing the working classes that involved a charge upon the rates. In order to give effect to that decision they resolved that they would pass no scheme for re-housing the working classes unless they had an assurance from the Finance Committee that they believed it would be self-supporting. I may say, as a member of the Finance Committee, that I have had, in common with my colleagues, considerable anxiety in giving that certificate, if I may call it so, but it has always been given after very careful consideration of the figures laid before us, and I am happy to say that the results, as far as we have them up to the present, show that in practically every case the order of the County Council that a charge should not be imposed upon the rates has been fulfilled. To be perfectly frank with your Lordships, I make one exception. It is an exception which proves the rule. During the time that these houses are being erected, and before any rent can be received in respect of them, the expenditure is bearing interest but brings back no return. A sum of about £40,000 under that heading has been inflicted on the ratepayers; on the other hand the surplusage, small as it is, because it is not the policy of the County Council to make a profit out of the working classes, has been sufficient very nearly to cover the sum fairly charged on the rates while the houses are in process of building.

The noble Earl also alluded to the Electric Power Bill. Here, again, the noble Earl has been rather severe upon me in respect of the words in which I laid the hesitation and doubts of the Finance Committee before the Council.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I intended to convey no imputation. I thought the words used by the noble Lord were excellent. All I said was that I hoped his deeds had been as good as his words.

LORD WELBY: I think that my words and the words of the Finance Committee were entirely justified. I have had a very long experience at the Treasury, and I certainly think that in matters of the same kind, letters from the Treasury to the great Departments would have been expressed in very much the same terms. But, as I have said, whatever the Finance Committee say unfortunately goes at once to the public and is made use of against the body who are receiving the advice. So far, I consider that the comments which were then made were justified, and did not mean that to the policy of the scheme the Finance Committee need have been opposed. We urged that the finance of the scheme should be carefully considered, and I imagine from what I have heard that its finance has been carefully examined and discussed in Committee of the other House.

With reference to the County Hall, there, again, I am not disposed to quarrel with my noble friend as to the manner in which he has spoken of the desirability of what we call co-ordinating expenditure; that is to say, when very large works have been undertaken, there is very fair and proper ground why the Council should hesitate before undertaking fresh works. An expenditure of £1,700,000 is a large one, but when the whole of the circumstances are considered I venture to think that the undertaking is by no means an uneconomical one, or one that is not very much called for. Certainly the outside criticism which I should apply to it would be this, that it is economical and desirable in itself, but it might be open to question whether, considering the very large expenditure involved in the tramways, it might not have been postponed for a year or so.

As to the comment which my noble friend made upon the preamble of the Bill, I think the statement is justified that the Bill had the approval of the Finance Committee. The fact of the matter is this. Capital expenditure is submitted to the Finance Committee, and I do not think the committee can escape the responsibility, when they have passed that expenditure, of what is involved in the word "approval." The Finance Committee are perfectly at liberty to make any comment they please upon the estimate so placed before them.

My noble friend has dwelt on the total amount which appears at the foot—£12,000,000. Unluckily—and this objection is not by any means confined to the County Council, for I remember perfectly well the same difficulty used to occur at the Treasury with regard to the provisions made for local loans—the people who estimate what they will want by way of loans always estimate largely. The gentlemen who used to come to the Treasury on behalf of the different Departments, stating what was wanted for different works, invariably estimated largely in excess of the amount they required, and I have known Chancellors of the Exchequer who were troubled at the amount which had to be placed in the Bills laid before Parliament because they knew those amounts would not be reached, while at the same time it was impossible for them to take the responsibility of cutting down that which had been put forward. The same thing, again in a minor way, occurs with us in the County Council. Large demands are made upon us which we are obliged to put into the Bill. There are no means of transferring a surplus on one head to meet a deficiency on another. All the compartments are watertight, and the consequence is that we have to make full provision. But with regard to this £12,000,000 may I give your Lordships the result of four years experience of these loans? I will take the four years from 1902 to 1905. We put into the Bill, after some pruning had taken place by the Finance Committee, on the average of the four years, £7,000,000. The actual expenditure on the average of those four years was exactly half that amount. I venture to call the attention of my noble friend opposite to this, because I think that, as a fair-minded man, he will at all events accept that as some modification of the remarks he made about the very large sum contained in this Bill.

I have been charged with making out that the finance of the County Council is unsound. Speaking for the Finance Committee I have not shrunk, by their advice and with their consent, from uttering the warnings, if I may call them so, to which allusion has frequently been made, and I venture to think that in so doing I have not in any way made it appear that the finance of the County Council is unsound. Noble Lords are apt to regard it perhaps from too narrow a point of view, and in judging whether the finance of the Council has been on the whole soundly administered I like to take a somewhat larger view. When you look at the large amount of capital expenditure that has been laid out and take into consideration how much has been paid off, I think the result is directly creditable to the County Council. I am aware that the amount of the sinking fund is stated by Parliament, and, therefore, I am not claiming for the County Council more credit than it deserves. Let me take what I think your Lordships will agree to be one of the finest sites in Europe—the Embankment. The Embankment cost very nearly two millions and a quarter. At the present moment the action of the sinking fund has paid off 75 per cent. of that debt, and the present ratepayers are in possession of that magnificent work with only a quarter of the expenditure which was necessary to secure it for them yet to be paid. I turn to another point, and take the] street improvements. Street improvements are to a great extent a matter of option. The sum of £24,000,000 has been laid out on street improvements. Of that no less than £13,000,000 has been paid off. Of all the cost of street improvements that has been incurred 60 per cent. has been paid off. Take the Holborn to Strand improvement. The excess was only caused by including a further site in the land which was taken for the purpose of the improvement, and which was therefore outside the original estimate. I think your Lordships will agree that it is a very difficult thing indeed to make an estimate of the amount required by such a site as that, and I think it reflects great credit on the expert officer, our valuer, when I say that I am informed on good authority that the acquisition of that very fine site is within the estimate which he originally laid before the Council, and which the Council sanctioned.

On these grounds I do venture to think that there is good reason for saying that in its main lines the finance of the Council has been conducted on prudent principles. I will take another great work—the main drainage. The main drainage cost, altogether, over £9,000,000. Half of that sum has already been repaid. I think that when your Lordships criticise what has been done and express the opinion that the County Council occasionally try too much at one time, you ought to recollect what has been done. I am sure you wish to be fair to the County Council and give them credit for the good work that has been accomplished. I do not think your Lordships can be aware of the pressure which is put upon the County Council to incur expenditure. Much of the expenditure to which exception is taken by my noble friend has not so much originated within the walls of Spring Gardens itself as from pressure outside. I do not mean to say for a moment that the County Council ought not to be responsible for the decision it takes in such a matter, but let me say that both the Press and the public are very exacting. I will give one instance. Nothing has given us more difficulty on the County Council—I grieve to say it—than providing for the increasing number of lunatics. The number of fresh asylums that have had to be built has been a very heavy call indeed on the finances of the county. Owing to their desire that the expenditure on new asylums should not be too heavy at one time, the Council erected temporary buildings at Colney Hatch Asylum. By a great misfortune a fire took place there. The Press, instead of understanding the reason which led to the temporary buildings, almost unanimously condemned us for not spending more money. We have to face this pressure which is put upon us from outside, and we have to do our best with regard to it. I do think that, considering the claims that are put upon us, considering the enormous amount of work, much of it having been handed on to us by Parliament, which we have to do, the County Council have not a bad record to show. I think they are able to show that they have done good work for London, and I venture also to say that, looking at their finance generally and the results of it, fair-minded men will agree that they have accomplished a great deal and in so doing, up to the present, at all events, have not put an undue strain on the finance of London.

*LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, we are under a great obligation to my noble friend Lord Camperdown for having initiated this discussion, and I think it is only fair to say that, great as the expenditure of the London County Council has been, if it had not been for the moderating influence of the noble Lord who has just sat down the County Council's expenditure out of the rates would probably have been still higher. There are two points in his speech upon which I should like to say a word or two. In claiming for the tramway earnings a measure of relief for the rates he omitted to distinguish between the two tramway systems, that on the North and that on the South of the Thames. It so happened that when the London County Council took over the tramways a similar amount of money was involved in the northern tramways as in the southern tramways, and the profits were approximately equal. But the London County Council leased the tramways on one side of the river to a company and worked the tramways on the other side themselves.

There is a very interesting article in the *Statist* of this week which contains an exhaustive examination of the working of the tramways, and the main result is that, whereas the ratepayers have received £190,000 from the tramways which were leased they have only received £24,000 from the tramways which were worked by the London County Council themselves, and I cannot help thinking that it clearly follows that if the County Council had leased both systems instead of only one the ratepayers of London would have been about £170,000 better off at the present time than they are. Moreover, if a sufficient amount of the central charges and for depreciation had been allowed, I doubt whether there would have been any profit at all. The amount of nominal profit which has been received from the system worked by the Council has been gradually diminishing until last year it came down to £4,000, and, if the depreciation had been treated last year in the same way as it had been treated hitherto, instead of there being a small profit there would have been a loss on the working of several thousand pounds.

LORD WELBY: The noble Lord must not forget that we have been entirely recasting the traction. I think it can hardly be expected that there should not be a considerable falling off in receipts during the time the whole traffic was put out of gear in the course of the electrification of the tramways.

*LORD AVEBURY: I was going to mention that some allowance, of course, ought to be made for the loss on working pending the conversion to electric traction. But my noble friend took credit for an amount of £210,000 as profit from tramways, and it is important to remember that of that amount no less than £190,000 has been derived from the tramways that were leased. I submit, therefore, that if we are really to embark in London on this further expenditure on tramways, the County Council should consider whether it would not be wiser to lease the lines than to work them themselves.

With regard to housing schemes there are two great differences. There are cases in which works are carried out and people displaced, and it is necessary to re-house them. In those cases the London County Council are under a statutory obligation, and have no option except to take the course which they have taken. But when it comes to carrying out housing schemes for the increase of accommodation for the working classes, the case stands on a very different footing. I had the honour of being vice-chairman of the London County Council at the time when this was first suggested, and I put myself in communication with the great concerns which have done so much to provide housing for the working classes. I asked them what the effect on their operations would be if the London County Council were to engage in this work. They one and all replied that if the London County Council, with the bottomless purse of the ratepayers, were going into the business, they themselves would not carry on any further operations of the kind; and I cannot help thinking that there would have been just as many or even more buildings for the working classes in London as at the present time if the London County Council had never built any. It is quite true that any loss on the operations has been trifling, comparatively; but I cannot help believing that in London and elsewhere, if it is known that the local authority are going to undertake this business themselves, private enterprise ceases, and in reality they defeat the very object they have in view.

My noble friend spoke of the finance of the London County Council, and I entirely agree with him that the credit of London justly stands very high. I for one have never complained of the finance of the Council, but only of the great expenditure of the Council. If this great expenditure is to be made, I do not know that we can severely criticise the manner in which the money has been raised. I think we owe a debt of thanks to the Finance Committee for the efforts they have made to control the expenditure and keep it within reasonable bounds; but the words in the Act, if I remember rightly, were that the Finance Commitee should "control" the expenditure. I have always understood that to mean that the Finance Committee were to act in the matter of the London County Council's finance somewhat in the same manner as the Treasury acts with reference to our national finance. Unfortunately, however, the system of separate committees proposing expenditure "subject to the consent of the Finance Committee" has tied the hands of the Finance Committee very much. They not unnaturally consider that the County Council had committed themselves to the expenditure, and that all they could do was to see that the expenditure was carried out as economically as possible.

I also agree with what my noble friend said with reference to the necessity of a County Hall. I know from my experience as chairman of the London County Council not only the great inconvenience, but the expense involved in the present arrangement, and the difficulty of working a great business with clerks scattered over a large number of houses. But I also feel with him that considering the enormous amount of expenditure in other ways, the County Hall scheme might have been postponed for a time. I sincerely trust that the discussion which has taken place in your Lordship's House this afternoon will tend to strengthen the hands of the Finance Committee, and that they will realise the very great responsibility which is thrown upon them to control the expenditure of the Council.

LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: My Lords, there is one point that I should like to call attention to before this Bill passes. A great deal of the money which is to be raised by this Bill concerns locomotion. The method in which this money is to be spent is one of the most important subjects that could possibly be discussed. Two Members of your Lordship's House—the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack and the noble Lord opposite—sat on the Royal Commission on London Traffic, and I very much regret that their recommendation has not yet been carried out. That Commission recommended that, owing to the very complex nature of the locomotion of London, a board should be constituted to deal with the problem as a whole, and a great deal of private enterprise in this direction has been refused to be sanctioned by Parliament, on the ground that until the traffic board has been constituted and the whole policy outlined, it would not be wise to give private companies any powers in this direction.

I am not at all certain that at least a portion of the £6,000,000 which I understand still remains to be expended on tramways will not be expended at considerable risk, if not wasted. It is a question now whether the railed system of locomotion is the most economical and fastest in great cities. No one can doubt that the motor omnibus is going to play an important part in conveying the millions of London, and I must say I think the London County Council are running a very grave risk in, so to speak, putting all their eggs into one basket. As to the figures, I would point out that the cost of running motor omnibuses has already diminished to 10½d. a mile, and I do not think that the County Council can claim to run their cars at less than 10d. a mile. Having regard to the short time motor omnibuses have been on the streets, I think it is a great risk for the Council to lay out so much money on tramways which may eventually be a dead loss to the ratepayers. Mr. John Burns, in an article in the *Pall Mall Magazine* of last month, expressed the opinion that the County Council ought to be the traffic authority for London. I entirely disagree. I fully acknowledge that the County Council have done a great deal of good work in regard to street widening, but on the question of traffic they are to a certain extent biassed, and to constitute them the Traffic Board would be to entrust this important duty to a body not possessing that independence of judgment which such a body should have. I can hardly conceive that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack or the noble Lord opposite would have appended their names to a Report recommending the constitution of a Traffic Board unless they had been convinced that it was the best thing for London; and in my opinion, Parliament should be very careful before they authorise the expenditure of any more money by the County Council in this direction pending the setting up of the Traffic Board recommended by the Royal Commission.

*Lord LUDLOW: My Lords, as a member of the London County Council, I was surprised to hear the statement made by Lord Camperdown to the effect that the tramways were, in his opinion, a paying concern. I have devoted great attention to this matter during the three years I have been on the London County Council, and I have no hesitation in saying that the tramways do not pay, and that that is the opinion of the Moderate Party on the Council. The noble Lord drew his conclusion from the amount of the receipts, but the noble Lord, the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the London County Council, has proved conclusively that these receipts are worth nothing as a guide in this matter. Lord Welby stated that the County Council admitted that the proportion paid from the highways account and the proportion paid from the tramways account in the matter of improvements were not relatively correct; I mean by that that when a street widening takes place for the purpose of making a tramway the greater portion of the cost is debited to the highways account. The County Council admit that that is wrong, and that there ought to be a fairer division. Therefore, I venture to think that the figures as to receipts are worth nothing. It is now agreed that in future a great deal more of the cost of these improvements should be debited to the tramways account. But we want more than that. We say that for the last ten years this has been going on and we want the Council to go back and revise the whole of the accounts. If that were done we submit that there would be a great deficit on the tramways account.

The County Hall is talked of as a thing which is necessary, but I cannot agree that that is so. The building is also spoken of as if it were already erected, and we were going to walk into it, but during the whole time of its erection we should still be occupying the same premises as at present and paying rent, rates, and taxes. I have had the honour of being on the Finance Committee for two years, and I can fully bear out the statement that Lord Welby and the Finance Committee do all they can to keep down the expense of the London County Council, but the drawback is that we have no budget. We do not draw up a budget at the beginning of the year; but, as the various recommendations are brought forward, we have to find the money. We do not know at the beginning of the year what our expenditure is going to be. At the Finance Committee, Lord Welby is always calling attention to the excessive way in which the Council are spending money, and at the meetings of the County Council he repeats that we are borrowing to such an extent that our credit is being ruined, and that whereas five or six years ago we borrowed money at 3½ per cent. we now borrow at 4 per cent.

Viscount GOSCHEN: My Lords, there is only one point connected with this very important subject to which I wish to be allowed to refer, and that is the present credit of the London County Council. I think that my noble friend Lord Welby took the criticism of my noble friend behind me in excellent part, and that he welcomes any support he can obtain from public opinion and from Parliament in, I will not say thwarting the expenditure of the enthusiastic reformers who are on the London County Council, but at any rate in restraining the pace at which they are going. My noble friend dropped a phrase which shows that he is entirely in accord with that principle. The works to be undertaken may be excellent in themselves, but there must be a certain moderation in taking up the vast number of schemes to which the London County Council commit themselves.

This question is not only a Metropolitan one; it almost becomes a national question. If the other great boroughs see that the London County Council, the premier council in this respect of the whole Empire, borrowing at the pace at which they have been borrowing, and producing Bills for £12,000,000 at a time like the present, I think it is calculated to have a disadvantageous effect on municipal finance generally. My noble friend Lord Avebury said that the credit of the London County Council was good, but I am surprised to hear that it is not as good as the credit of Manchester, Birmingham, and Liverpool. I do not know whether my noble friend would confirm or dispute that, but I am told that these cities are able to borrow more cheaply than the London County Council. If that is so, it appears to me that it is a most serious warning to the London County Council as to the degree to which they are straining their credit, and it is a circumstance which should induce the Council to look to their ways.

I associate myself with what has been said with regard to Lord Welby. I think that London is fortunate in having my noble friend as its chief Finance Minister, if I may use that term. He is a trained economist; he is an economist by nature; never was there a greater economist whom I have had the pleasure of knowing in my administrative experience, and it is an irony of fate that my noble friend should have to guide the financial counsels of the London County Council at this time—I will not say in the most extravagant moments of the Council, because I have no wish to say anything derogatory to the Council, or to express any kind of censure. All I wish to do is to add to the note of warning which has been given, and from the way in which your Lordships have received the speech of my noble friend Lord Camperdown, I feel sure that this House is desirous that a note of warning should be conveyed through my noble friend to the London County Council.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I would venture to say a few words in answer to the observations which have been made on the other side of the House, and I think I am entitled to do so, having had greater experience of the London County Council than any member of your Lordships' House. I have sat upon it since the beginning, and have fought six contested elections. At each of those elections the various points made by noble Lords opposite have been brought forward and considered by the ratepayers, and on every single occasion except one, when the voting was equal, the policy of the predominant party on the Council has always prevailed. The noble Viscount (Viscount Goschen) smiles. If the noble Viscount means to say—and I hope he does not—that the expenditure of the London County Council is extremely foolish, then I think he must also add that the ratepayers——

VISCOUNT GOSCHEN: I was thinking of another instance where there has been extreme extravagance by a board of guardians elected by the ratepayers. I did not intend to smile at the London County Council.

LORD MONKSWELL: I am surprised to hear that the rate at which money can be raised in Birmingham is less than that which has to be paid by the London County Council. That is remarkable, because the debt of London is barely one and a quarter times the annual value of the property in London, whereas in Birmingham the debt is twice the annual value of the property. The unremunerative debt of Manchester, again, is more than three times the annual rateable value, so that it does seem to me that, if it is the case that the London County Council have to borrow on worse terms than Manchester or Birmingham, it must be for some other reason than that of extravagance.

I should like to say one word as to the position which has always been occupied by the Finance Committee of the London County Council. We hold on the Council—and I do not think this is a question between Moderates and Progressives—that the Council must be supreme over its committees, and, when noble Lords talk of the analogy of the Treasury, it seems to me that the Finance Committee of the County Council is very much in the same position as the Treasury. The Treasury can be over-ruled by the Cabinet; the Finance Committee of the County Council can be over-ruled by the Council. The only difference is that we do not know when the Cabinet over-rules the Treasury, but we do know when the Finance Committee of the County Council are over-ruled.

I desire to make one observation with regard to tramways. The tramways of the London County Council are going through a transition period, but nobody who has had experience of the systems on the north and the south of the Thames will deny that where we are in command the tramway is more efficient than where a company is in possession. As to steamboats, the running of steamers on the Thames is purely an experiment. It has always been so treated in the London County Council. There was a unanimous demand that the experiment should be tried. I was not at all sure that it would be successful, but it was impossible for the Council to withstand the pressure applied at the last election. After all, if the experiment is to fail it is not a very disastrous failure. I am afraid we shall lose £50,000 next year, but the service seems to be getting more popular, and if we continue it for another year probably the deficit will be very considerably reduced. The noble Earl (Lord Donoughmore) laughs at that suggestion, but I can assure him we have reason to suppose that the steamers are becoming more popular. I happen to live on the river and I see the steamers pass my drawing-room window in a crowded state in the summer, and I hope that in the near future they will not impose much urden on the London ratepayers.

Lord Monkswell.

I would like to have said a word about housing, but as my noble friend Earl Carrington wishes to deal with that subject, I shall say no more beyond this, that just as in the case of steamers we had no option but to try the experiment, so in the case of housing there was a unanimous demand at every county council election that we should carry out a housing scheme. I entirely associate myself with all that has been said as to the extreme value of the services of Lord Welby and of the Finance Committee of the Council.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, after the very interesting debate that we have had I do not intend to detain the House at any length, but I am sure your Lordships were all delighted with the enthusiasm of the noble Lord who has just sat down for the work of the London County Council. He naturally is proud of the institution of which he has been a member since its birth, but he will forgive us if we do not all quite entertain the same enthusiasm. Your Lordships have a very special responsibility in considering a Bill such as the one now before us, because the position of the London County Council as regards their financial proposals is a very peculiar one. Most of the local authorities do their work under the guidance, and I might almost say the check, of a Government Department, but the London County Council are an exception to this rule. The London County Council do not submit schemes for raising capital to any Government Department. Instead of doing so, they come annually to Parliament with a Money Bill such as this. One cannot help noticing that local authorities have not always liked the check to which they have been subjected by Government Departments. I read the other day an interesting article in the *Pall Mall Magazine* by one of His Majesty's Ministers. In this article Mr. John Burns spoke of the improvements carried out by the London County Council—

> "in the teeth of the cold neutrality or thinly veiled hostility of every Imperial Department that has intervened in London affairs only too often in the past to restrict or hamper them."

I am sure it is a matter of congratulation to Mr. John Burns that the check which he has felt so sorely in the past can now be removed through his own efforts.

I would refer briefly to one or two points which have been raised by representatives of the London County Council opposite. Lord Welby, I thought, suggested that the County Council had been unfairly criticised for putting forward estimates at times which had not always proved justified or accurate, and he quoted cases in which accuracy had been attained, and claimed that they were extremely creditable to the various committees concerned. I do not deny that a satisfactory estimate is a credit to the author, but some of these estimates shown in the schedule of the Bill now before us are of a very extreme character, and I think that the animadversions made upon them by the noble Earl behind me were fully justified. Turning to No. 8, I find that the original estimate presented to the Council for rebuilding Vauxhall Bridge and the construction of approaches, including the purchase of property and compensation, was £484,000. The revised estimate is £535,000. The revised estimate is 10 per cent. over the Parliamentary estimate, and 18 per cent. over the estimate that was originally submitted to the London County Council when they decided in 1894 to promote the Bill to build the bridge.

LORD WELBY: The reason of that increase is that more land was found necessary for the improvement than was originally estimated for. It was not a mistake in estimating.

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: I can only say that if during the last two years I had made such a mistake as to calculate on too small a portion of land being taken for work in which the War Office were concerned I should have had a very ugly time with the officials at the Treasury. But in the case of the London County Council apparently nobody takes any notice at all. The cost of the Tower Bridge northern approach was 112 per cent. over the original Parliamentary estimate; the cost of the Greenwich tunnel was 16 per cent. over the Parliamentary estimate, and 160 per cent. over the estimate originally submitted to the Council in June, 1896. If a public Department dared to make such a mistake as that they would not hear the end of it for months, but this sort of thing appears in the schedule of a Bill promoted by the London County Council and moved by the noble Lord opposite without a single word of explanation. Again, much has been said about the steamboats. Noble Lords opposite do not like our suggestion that the steamboats are an extremely bad speculation and they plead for more time. What is happening in this matter, to put it in one sentence, is that the London County Council are spending £2 to earn £1. They can go on doing that so long as they like, but if they continue on that basis they will have some difficulty in persuading your Lordships that they are embarked on a profitable undertaking.

One word with reference to the tramways. I was extremely glad to hear from the noble Lord opposite that the Council felt that in future more than one-third of the cost of improvements should be charged to the tramways account, but I would remind the noble Lord that theory is one thing and practice another. I would quote the case of the St. John's Street, Clerkenwell, improvement. The ordinary arrangement was made as to the terms on which that widening should be carried out, and one-third of the cost was charged to the tramways account; but I noticed in the annual report of the proceedings of the London County Council for the year ended March 31st, 1905, this statement—

> "The widening of St. John's Street, Clerkenwell, authorised by the London County Council Improvements Act, 1900, was completed on April 8th, 1904, and the maintenance and control of the widened thoroughfare has been handed over to the Finsbury Metropolitan Borough Council."

The report went on to give details, and stated that one-third was to be charged to the tramways account. But here is the kernel of the matter—

> "The Council, however, on October 29th, 1901, agreed to relieve the tramways account of this liability on the understanding that the liability should be revived and be met at a future time if the profits from the proposed tramway should prove to be sufficient to meet such liability in whole or in part."

That means that if the profits of a particular tramway are sufficient to justify it, this charge will be made, but if the profits do not justify it the result is that the capital is cut down and charged to something else, and the true capital cost of the tramway is not shown. I hope there may be some reason for this procedure on the part of the London County Council, but the result must inevitably be most unfortunate, for the public sees accounts in connection with these tramways which do not show truthfully and properly the true state of the case as regards the expenditure that has been incurred upon them. I hold most strongly that when municipalities engage in these enterprises they should be under exactly the same obligations with regard to the presentation of their accounts as a public company, and that this watering down of capital is wrong. I hope that the influence of the noble Lord the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the London County Council will be exerted in future to obviate a repetition of this kind of thing.

The noble Lord who has just sat down stated that in his opinion the relations of the Finance Committee to the County Council were very similar to the relations of the Treasury to the other Government Departments. I can only say that that is not the opinion of the Finance Committee of the Council. I will read a short extract from the annual report of the Finance Committee for 1903—

> "We have for a long time been impressed with the desirability of establishing some system by which the Council shall be able to co-ordinate its expenditure and thus regulate to some extent the amount of its borrowings from time to time."

If their position were the same as that of the Treasury they would not find it necessary to advocate a change in that direction. I venture to think that noble Lords behind me have been right in urging that the position of the Finance Committee of the London County Council is not a satisfactory one, and not in accordance with the intention of the Legislature in 1888. I trust that this evening's discussion may at any rate have one result—a result which has been hoped for by several speakers this evening, that of strengthening the hands of the noble Lord opposite and of securing that in future he will be in reality the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the London County Council and not the mere registrar of their financial decisions.

LORD WELBY: Having had some experience in both departments, I venture to think that the functions of the Finance Committee of the London County Council very closely resemble those of the Treasury. I will not take up the time of your Lordships by further explanation, but I think the instance which the noble Earl brought forward is hardly in point in that respect.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, I think the House ought to remember that we have been discussing simply a Money Bill. All these works have been authorised, and we are merely asking the House this afternoon to pass the Bill which is to provide the money. I believe I am correct in saying that on no previous occasion has such a Bill of the Council's been discussed. I am of opinion, however, that nothing but good can come of a discussion in this House or in another place as regards the finances of the London County Council. London is a great city equal to a kingdom. It has a population of over 5,000,000, more than that of the whole of Australia. To keep that great population in health and comparative comfort a great expenditure of public money is, of course, necessary, and it is not surprising that £12,000,000 annually should be spent for that object. The chief point of attack on the London County Council this evening has been the very vexed question of steamboats. As to the Council's steamboats, that scheme is after all, only an experiment, and not a very costly one. The most that it can cost this year is £50,000. The real municipal enterprises of the County Council are the tramways and the housing schemes. I was very glad to hear my noble friend Lord Camperdown say that he thought the tramways would turn out a successful undertaking.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I said that so far as I could form a judgment from such limited experience as I had obtained from sitting on this Committee and hearing the evidence, it seemed to me there was a fair chance of the undertaking's turning out a success.

EARL CARRINGTON: I am glad that the experience of the noble Lord leads him to make that statement in public. I would remind the House that the tramways are of the most vital importance to the people of London. I do not think I am exaggerating in the slightest degree when I say that better locomotion is the only way of solving the housing problem which is always before us. Viscount Goschen gave a timely note of warning as to municipal extravagance, and he referred to the amount required for loans by the different municipalities. I think I ought to remind your Lordships that £3,000,000 of these loans which the County Council have to find, and which are in this Bill, are loans over which the London County Council have no authority whatever; they are merely bankers for the local authorities and have to find the money.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: So much of it as they see fit.

EARL CARRINGTON: They have very little to say to it. When the London municipalities were brought into being it was foreshadowed by the late Lord Salisbury, when he advised his followers to capture the different seats on the London County Council and to smash it, that they were to be in no way subservient to the County Council. They were to be practically independent; and this great sum is brought on the rates for which I do not think we on the County Council can honestly be held responsible.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: If the noble Earl will look at Clause 6 he will see these words—

"The Council may lend to such corporation or other public body, and such corporation or other public body may borrow from the Council such money as the Council think fit."

EARL CARRINGTON: I quite agree. I now turn to the question of housing, which I think may be considered one of the most important of the London County Council's responsibilities. We have been taken to task for the expenses that have been incurred in that very necessary enterprise, but I would like to remind the House of Lords that by their clearances of the Clare Market and Boundary Street sites the County Council have reduced a mortality of forty per 1,000 to one of ten per 1,000. Even if we have made some mistakes in small matters, such as steamboats, surely we may claim credit for those great works which have been of such incalculable benefit to the people of London. I need not refer to what has been done at Millbank and other places or to the two great model lodging-houses on the Rowton pattern which the London County Council have built, but I would ask your Lordships always to remember that the Council's rehousing schemes are on a self-supporting basis. If the Council have done so badly and been so extravagant, I ask, how is it that the Progressive majority keeps up to the level of two to one? Indeed, I think that majority is too large, and all lovers of London would be only too glad if the Moderate Party had some policy to lay before the people and so were able to capture some seats.

I honestly think that we on the London County Council have nothing to be ashamed of. Look at what has been done in connection with parks, bands, the fire brigade, the bridges, main drainage, street improvements, asylums, weights and measures—I venture to think that in all these things we have done our duty fearlessly and courageously. One noble Lord said that Mr. Baker, the Chairman of the Highways Committee, was an expensive luxury in the matter of tramways. I would ask your Lordships to consider what a luxury these electric trams are, and how vitally necessary they are to the women and girls of South London who have to travel long distances to their work, and who, through the unhappy mistake of your Lordships last year, have now to walk over the bridges instead of being able to ride without any extra expense in the comfortable, warm and well-lighted trams of the London County Council. In spite of all our alleged wrong-doing I honestly believe that London in the main endorses our policy. I have been on the London County Council now for fifteen years. I have fought five contested elections. My first majority was 120, but my majority at the last election was 1,500. I have consistently supported the Progressive policy during those fifteen years, and I do not think that the people of my own constituency—West St. Pancras—which has a huge working class population, have lost their confidence in me or have failed to recognise with satisfaction the efforts of the County Council to promote the welfare and ameliorate the conditions of the over-worked and heavily-taxed people of the Metropolis.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, I wish to put in a word of caution against a suggestion thrown out by the noble Earl who raised this discussion. This is a Money Bill. We are dealing with finance more than policy, and I do think that to adopt the suggestion that the London County Council, merely because they have discretion whether or not they advance money to local authorities, should exercise that discretion in accordance with their judgment as to the wisdom of the purposes for which the smaller authorities borrow, would be most disastrous to the interests of London. I would also point out that it is to the advantage of London that all its debt should be as far as possible in one Stock.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture will pardon me if I suggest that his defence of the London County Council was scarcely so successful or so relevant as that of my noble friend Lord Welby. I cannot see that the fact that the supporters of the noble Earl are as two to one in the County Council, or that he has himself had for a long time the honour of representing an influential constituency have very much to do with the matters which we are discussing. The noble Earl rather took exception to, or suggested that there was something novel or unheard of in, the House of Lords attempting to debate a Money Bill of this kind. All I can say is that if this is the first occasion upon which your Lordships have debated a London County Council Money Bill I hope it will not be the last.

But the noble Earl seems to imagine that there is a desire in the minds of some of your Lordships to stand in the way of these great municipal improvements. He is quite mistaken. I think we all of us admit that the age in which we are living is one when all classes insist, and rightly insist, upon having the surroundings of their daily life made more healthy and more attractive, and I for one am sincerely grateful, not only to the London County Council, but to other municipal bodies, for what they have done in giving us better thoroughfares, better lighted and more cleanly streets, better buildings, and other improvements of many kinds. But what we feel is that it is not desirable that all these things should be done at once. It is, as my noble friend Lord Goschen said, a question of pace, and I wish to add my voice to that of those who have made a plea this evening for what I might call imposing a speed limit on the London County Council. We have a right in this House to offer these criticisms and suggestions, because if they are not made here I do not quite know where they are to be made. The London County Council enjoys an amount of independence not enjoyed, so far as I am aware, by any other municipal body in the United Kingdom. It is, as has been already, I think, pointed out, allowed to proceed with little or no intervention from the Local Government Board. It is theoretically under the control and guidance of its own Finance Committee, but the evidence which has been brought forward this evening shows how very unsubstantial that control is.

LORD WELBY: In innumerable instances the Treasury does exercise a check.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I accept that if the noble Lord says so. Like many other people, I was greatly reassured by knowing that he and a distinguished colleague of his, Sir Francis Mowatt, were members of this Finance Committee. They were regarded by us as towers of strength, but I am afraid we must admit that in their re-incarnation, if I may say so, as members of the London County Council, they are considerably shorn of the great powers which they used to exercise when we knew them as high officials at the Treasury. I can remember times when great Departments quailed before the eye of my noble friend and when Ministers were anxious to convert him to their views. He is now only, if I may say so, a pale ghost of his former self, and we have listened to, I might almost say, pathetic extracts from his speeches, in which he gave the soundest advice to his colleagues, only to have that advice put on one side with something very like indifference.

What has been the result of this wholesale expenditure, this wholesale borrowing on the part of the London County Council? Lord Welby put before the House what I think he called a broader view of the financial position of the County Council, and he showed that, after all, they had only hypothecated one year's annual revenue, whereas other great cities were in debt to double that extent. But, my Lords, that does not seem to me really to affect the argument which has been used to-night. The argument which has been used is that these indiscriminate borrowings have had the effect of shaking the credit of the London County Council, and that, I think, has been proved to the hilt by the fact mentioned by Lord Goschen, that three great cities—Birmingham, Manchester and Liverpool—are at this moment able to borrow on cheaper terms than the London County Council. Not only is that the case, but I believe I am right in saying that the securities of the London Water Board are quoted at a higher figure than the securities of the London County Council.

Lord WELBY: The Water Board has the whole of the water rental as well as the rates as its securities.

***The Marquess of LANSDOWNE**: I accept that as far as the Water Board is concerned. But it does not convince me as regards the relative credit of the London County Council and the three great cities I have named. Lord Monkswell referred to this point, and said the comparatively low credit of the London County Council had to be explained by some other mysterious fact. I do not think there is any mystery about it. It is accounted for by the fact that in the City it is known that the London County Council are constantly making these applications for new loans, and that nobody knows what other applications there may be lying behind those which are scheduled in this Bill. A year ago a well-known member of the London County Council, and an ex-Chairman of that body, used these words—

> "The commitments of the Council are appalling. Its financial position is one that I look upon with grave doubts as to what is to be done in the future."

That is the view that is held, I believe, by a great number of those who have anxiously watched the progress of County Council finance, and this Bill bristles with illustrations of what I am saying. I am not going through the schedule again, because it has been quoted, but here is a Bill which, by a stroke of the pen, adds £12,000,000 to the debt of London, and there is nothing in the Bill to show how far any one of those heads of expenditure is a final head of expenditure, or whether they represent only mere instalments on account. We know from experience that these County Council estimates have not been by any means trustworthy in the past. My noble friend Lord Donoughmore referred to half a dozen of them in which there were wide discrepancies between the original Parliamentary estimate and the revised estimate made a year or two afterwards. One word as to the Hotel de Ville—I do not know what the proper title of the building is.

Earl CARRINGTON: The County Hall.

***The Marquess of LANSDOWNE**: I quite understand that there should be a very great advantage in concentrating under one roof the many scattered offices in which the work of the County Council is now done but one would expect that such concentration would lead to reductions in the strength of the staff and to a more economically worked office, but we are told that the number of clerks, which now stands, I believe, at 2,000, is to be increased to 2,300, and if all these additional and extraneous schemes of which we have heard are taken up, where is the end to be? Your building, large as it is, will not be large enough, and you will have to add to its dimensions. I was much struck by the sagacious remark which fell from Lord Welby during the course of his speech, when he told your Lordships that in his view this particular enterprise might well have stood over for the present.

With regard to the future, we can only hope that the result of this debate may be to convince the County Council and the public that we do stand in need of greater frugality and moderation in the expenditure of the ratepayers' money. I hope, above all things, that the County Council will be induced to avoid taking up what I would venture to describe as fancy enterprises—enterprises of which these steamboats, about which we have heard so much to-night, are a type and an example. My noble friend Lord Carrington, in his light-hearted way, treated the loss upon the steamboat account as quite a trivial matter; but surely £51,000 a year, representing the interest upon, I suppose, over a million of money, is not a piece of extravagance to which we can be absolutely indifferent. I would venture to make a humble suggestion. I gather from something which has been said this evening that this flotilla has been so destructive to other shipping in the river that the rate of insurance upon it has been increased. Could not the whole flotilla be handed over, on cheap and tempting terms, to some third-rate Power in some other part of the world?

I have also been told that the County Council contemplate or have made a beginning in supplying the county with ambulances. That seems to me to be a matter scarcely within their proper functions. The same may be said, I think, of the desire evidenced at every turn to embark in municipal trading of all sorts—for example, the supply of electricity in bulk, even, I understand, outside the limits of London. Surely that is going beyond the legitimate scope of the operations which we should expect this great municipal body to undertake, and the effect cannot be otherwise than detrimental. It must have a deterrent effect on private enterprise. If those who desire to develop private enterprise find themselves at every turn competing with some huge Government agency, they will naturally draw in their horns and we shall hear no more of them.

Then there was another point made by my noble friend Lord Montagu which certainly ought not to be lost sight of. We are told, for example, that these tramways will in time be extremely remunerative, but we must never allow ourselves to forget that science never stands still, and that as years go by the inventions which are up-to-date to-day become the obsolete inventions of the future, and if that should happen you may find your municipal authorities loaded with all sorts of enterprises, promising indeed when they were first started, but in their old age useless and ruinous to those who have invested money in promoting them.

I will bring the few words I have to say to a conclusion by repeating that I am one of those who are proud of the city of London, and desire to see it made as attractive, healthy, and beautiful as possible. I do not wish in the least to stand in the way of legitimate improvements, but these things can be overdone, and I do not think that we shall make London a better place to live in in the long run if, while we try to tempt people to it by improving its thoroughfares and beautifying its buildings, we at one and the same time make it such an expensive place to live in that people are inclined to fly beyond its limits.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, I do not raise the smallest objection to the interesting discussion which has taken place in respect to this Bill. The purpose of bringing the Bill before Parliament is that if this or the other House think fit to discuss it, they shall be perfectly free to do so. I have no doubt advantage will be derived from the discussion which has taken place to-night. I hope and believe the London County Council will give full consideration to the various criticisms which have been made of their proceedings. No doubt they stand in a special position. We have never heard, and we never shall hear, of any such discussion in respect, to the expenditure of any other of the reat cities of this Empire; but, of course, it is natural, the London County Council not being subject to some of the restrictions which lie upon municipalities generally, and Parliament having this Bill brought annually before it, that it should be discussed and that any criticisms which noble Lords or others choose to make should be raised.

But I cannot help having a certain feeling that noble Lords opposite are very unnatural parents. The London County Council is their creation, yet it has been the object of the criticism and hostility of the Party opposite almost from the day of its birth. I hope, nevertheless, that its members will carefully consider the criticisms which have been so freely made. I am bound to say that, although I do think there is a little of the stepmother element in the view which has been taken of this question by the Conservative Party almost from the beginning, the criticisms to-night have been made in a more friendly and less carping spirit than some we have heard, I will not say in this House, but elsewhere on previous occasions. Something has been said about the credit of the London County Council. Your Lordships probably know that the last loan raised by the London County Council was at 97. That does not indicate anything very bad in the nature of their credit. Many securities have fallen greatly and very rapidly within the last few years. Even Consols themselves have tumbled down to a very serious extent, and at a very rapid rate at times. When you talk about the borrowings of the London County Council, one thing must be considered. It has been said that the London County Council are under fewer restrictions than other municipal bodies. In a certain sense they are, but in one respect they are under a very curious restriction which does not make for economy. The local boroughs created a good many years after the establishment of the County Council have an appeal to the Local Government Board if a loan which they desire is refused by the London County Council. A good deal of the borrowing of the London County Council is due, I suspect, to that source. All I wish to say is this. You have here a great body, a body that I believe has done a large and very valuable work for this Metropolis. You have here a great body, representing, upon a basis which commended itself to noble Lords opposite, the people of London. I do not say that that is a reason why you should not criticise its proceedings, as this annual Bill gives you the power of doing if you think fit; but I do say that this great body, performing such valuable work for the county, is entitled, whenever you do criticise its proceedings to the most respectful consideration of this House.

On Question, Bill read 2^a and committed.

PETITIONS.

SUNDAY CLOSING OF SHOPS, ETC.

Petition in favour of legislation of nine meetings in diocese of Carlisle; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Report from the Committee of Selection that the following Lords be proposed to the House as the panel of Lords to act as Commissioners under the Act, viz., V. Hill, L. Torphichen; agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly.

TREATY SERIES, No. 8 (1906).

Accession of Columbia to the Convention signed at Geneva, 22nd August, 1864, for the amelioration of the condition of the wounded in armies in the field. (June 7th, 1906.)

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS, 1905).

Report on the Agricultural Returns relating to acreage and produce of crops and number of live stock in Great Britain, with Summaries for the United Kingdom, British Possessions, and foreign countries, and particulars of prices, imports, and exports of agricultural produce.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

GAS AND WATER WORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.

Reports by the Board of Trade as to the grounds on which they have dispensed (1) with the consents of certain local and road authorities in the case of the Mid-Kent Water Provisional Order; (2) with the consent of the Chippenham Rural District Council in the case of the Corsham Gas Provisional Order.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated July 3rd, 1906, declaring Chinanfu to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1876.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889.

University Court Ordinance, No. XVI. (Glasgow, No. 4), Institution of a degree in science in pharmacy: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and to be printed. (No. 154.)

JUVENILE SMOKING BILL [H.L.].

Report from the Select Committee, That it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

JUVENILE SMOKING.

Report from the Select Committee (with the proceedings of the Committee), made, and to be printed. (No. 155.) Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix laid upon the Table, and to be delivered out.

RESERVE OFFICERS.

Lord ROSMEAD rose to ask His Majesty's Government if they would appoint a Committee to investigate into the alleged grievances of the senior Reserve officers who were called up for service during the late war in South Africa. The noble Lord said: My Lords, it may be within the recollection of some of your Lordships that I first brought this matter to the notice of this House so long ago as May, 1903.† On that occasion the then Under-Secretary of State for War, during his speech in answer to my Motion, made the following statement to your Lordships—

> "I admit that grievances have arisen in exceptional cases. Not every officer who has been re-employed has a grievance, but there are special cases in which the Secretary of State for War thinks that some redress may be necessary. For that reason my right hon. friend has recently appointed a Committee which is inquiring into the whole subject; and if, on the Report of that Committee, he is able to see his way to put forward proposals for the consideration of the Treasury he will do so." ‡

Those, my Lords, were the words of the Under-Secretary of State for War in May, 1903. I have since been informed on several occasions by my noble friend the late Under-Secretary of State for War that such a Committee did exist, and that it was a War Office Committee. All I can venture to say is that it was a very mysterious Committee, as I have never been able to ascertain what report it made, if it ever made one, which I very much doubt. There is one thing very evident, and that is, that this mysterious Committee took no evidence, as several Reserve officers who were affected came forward, and asked to give evidence before it, and they were refused.

I am also informed that an appeal by those officers was made about a year ago to Mr. Arnold-Forster, when he was in office, to allow the matter to be referred to arbitration by the then Lord Chancellor, and that this appeal did not even elicit a reply. I do trust the present Government, several members of which have consistently shown their sympathy with the grievances of the senior Reserve officers who were called up for service during the late war, and some of whom did me the honour of going into the lobby with me when I divided your Lordships' House unsuccessfully last year on this subject, will appoint a Committee to inquire into the whole matter, and that such an inquiry will be as open a one as possible, and that at any rate those officers who come forward will be permitted to give evidence before it.

The UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): My Lords, the whole case of the officers referred to has been the subject of most careful consideration, but I regret to have to inform the noble Lord that it has not been found practicable to re-open the question which has been previously considered and definitely settled. The decision therefore already arrived at regarding the emoluments of the retired officers temporarily employed during the South African campaign must be adhered to. Regulations have, however, been prepared with a view to making the pay drawn during re-employment quite independent of either retired pay or gratuity, and the Army Council are, therefore, confident that any apparent difficulties in the interpretation of the Royal Warrant will be avoided in future, and any anomaly such as that which occurred in the past will not occur again.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cxxii., 277 *et seq.*

‡ See (4) *Debates*, cxxii., 280.

EXPERIMENTAL MOBILISATION.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS rose to ask the Under-Secretary of State for War who had stated that "we had a mobilisation scheme under which it is hoped we could mobilise as quickly as could any Continental nation;" whether he would, to test our military home defensive preparedness, give notice to one of our military "commands"—chosen by lot the day notice is given— to take the field, self-complete in all respects, with all possible speed; Aldershot and the Curragh being excluded from the chance selection.

The noble Earl said: My Lords, I have only a few words to say in support of the notice standing in my name on the Paper. I wish to remind your Lordships that last year you unanimously passed a Resolution that in the opinion of this House it was desirable that our land defences should be at all times such that no nation would ever think of a hostile landing on our shores. The other day I pointed out how quickly foreign nations could mobilise, and my noble friend, in replying to me, said that we had a mobilisation scheme under which it was hoped we could mobilise as quickly as could any Continental nation. I think your Lordships will admit that, considering that we spend £29,000,000, and that your Lordships have agreed that our home defence should be such that no nation would ever think of a hostile landing on our shores, we should know what our state of preparedness is, and that my noble friend should test his mobilisation scheme in the same way as the Navy has just tested naval mobilisation, under which men called out unexpectedly were mobilised ready for service within twenty-four hours. We want the same test in regard to our military preparedness. I beg to put the Question standing in my name.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: My Lords, my reply to my noble friend must, I fear, be in the negative for several reasons. In the first place, our mobilisation arrangements were tested in 1899 for the South African War, and perhaps the best commentary on how they worked then is furnished in the Report of the Elgin Commission, where we find the following statement—

> "The evidence before the Committee shows that mobilisation was effected smoothly and with remarkable despatch."

In support of this conclusion the Commissioners refer to the evidence of Colonel Robb, an officer of the Adjutant-General's Department, who was intimately concerned with mobilisation arrangements at the War Office. That officer says—

> "I have never known such an absolutely quiet time at the War Office as immediately after the issue of mobilisation orders,"

and again—

> "The mobilisation regulations worked extremely smoothly as regards the formed bodies of men who were supposed to be mobilised under them."

The Commission also draws attention to the evidence of General Sir Frederick Stopford, who for some time past has been Director of Military Training at headquarters. He stated—

> "Mobilisation is a comparatively new organisation in our Army, and all the arrangements connected with it were not complete in 1899, but they were sufficiently in progress to admit of the mobilisation being carried out successfully."

If we turn to the evidence of Lord Wolseley, the then Commander-in-Chief, we find in a Report referring to the mobilisation and embarkation of the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th divisions that—

> "In preparing, equipping and despatching this large body of men, the machinery of mobilisation and embarkation has worked without a serious hitch of any kind."

I now come to the second of my reasons. My noble friend's proposed experiment would cause serious public inconvenience in withdrawing Reservists from their employment, and for the mere purpose of what we consider an unnecessary experiment this would be unjustifiable. In the third place, and this is by no means the least important objection to my noble friend's proposal, I am informed by financial experts that his proposition would involve an expenditure of from £5,000 to possibly £25,000——

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: That is very cheap.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: In the present financial situation I am afraid that would scarcely be regarded as commendable, and even if any such expenditure appeared tolerable to your Lordships I am quite sure it would not be tolerated in another place, in whose hands lie the public purse strings. Once the order to mobilise is given the Reservists who are called up must be paid and fed and equipped for whatever length of time it was decided to keep them. The transport of these men from their homes throughout the country to the various depots of the regiments and the transport of various bodies of troops to the large mobilisation centres would also entail considerable expenditure. These are only two items in the general work of mobilisation, but I am sure they suffice to show your Lordships that mobilisation, even though carried out with the greatest smoothness and despatch, necessarily involves a very considerable outlay of public money, and in our opinion should only be resorted to for experimental purposes when the strongest case has been made out for its necessity.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I wish to give notice that on Friday of next week I propose to move the following Resolution—

> "That this House, having last Session unanimously resolved that our home land defence should at all times be such that no nation would ever attempt in any form an hostile landing on our shores, is of opinion that the present state of preparedness should be forthwith practically tested, as recently suggested in the Question addressed to the Under-Secretary of State for War on July 9th."

*THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I should like to point out with what satisfaction I have heard from my noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War that he considers £25,000 a large sum. The noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture earlier in the evening regarded £50,000 as a mere bagatelle, and I would suggest to my noble friend opposite that he should take the noble Earl under his wing and teach him a little at the War Office as to what economy really is.

SOLDIERS' MARRIED QUARTERS.

THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH: My Lords, I rise to ask the Under-Secretary of State for War if he is aware that in Lichfield Barracks one bedroom only is allotted to married people with two children, and that in some cases where the whole family have to sleep in the one room, the mothers are in an advanced stage of consumption; whether it is in the power of local sanitary authorities to take action in such cases; and to move for a Return showing the state of things in other barracks.

I think it is only fair to state that the moment notice was called to this case action was taken, but I do think this is a matter of so serious a character that it ought not to be left to an individual to draw attention to it. I know quite well that there are two types of barracks, the old construction type and the new construction type, and that Lichfield barracks come within the former category. I understand that in a great many of the barracks of the old construction the state of things is as bad as, if not worse than, in Lichfield Barracks, and I therefore make no apology for calling attention to this matter. I think the state of the married quarters in these barracks ought to be generally known, and I hope the noble Earl will agree to the presentation of the Return for which I ask.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: My Lords, in reply to my noble friend, I will deal first with that part of his Question which refers to consumptive mothers occupying the same sleeping apartment as the rest of the family. I find on investigation that two such cases did occur at Lichfield, but as soon as this was brought to notice, orders were immediately given for further accommodation, and this was done by placing other families on the lodging list, *i.e.*, giving them lodgings outside barracks. The two women in question now occupy separate rooms in the quarters allotted for their respective families. At the same time I should like to point out that at Lichfield there are thirty-four married quarters which contain two bedrooms and ten which contain three bedrooms.

As regards the general question, the Army Council fully recognise the importance of the adequate provision of suitable married quarters, but to bring all the present quarters fully up to modern standards cannot be done in a day. In part 1, Vote 10, Army Estimates of 1906–7, an item of £95,000 stands for the general improvement of married quarters, and we expect to spend £12,300 in the present financial year; that is to say, we recognise generally the necessity of improvements, as soon as money is available, to the extent of £95,000. As regards the power of local sanitary authorities to take action, I am informed that under Section 327, sub-section 2, of the Public Health Act, 1875, the local civil authorities have no power of entering into or interference with War Department property, whether in the occupation of the War Department or its tenants.

Concerning the state of things in other barracks about which my noble friend asks for a Return, I understand that there are altogether 13,390 married quarters. Of these 1,874 are one-room quarters, and of these there are two in Lichfield; 7,713 are two-room quarters; 3,060 quarters consisting of three rooms and a scullery; and 743 four-room quarters. As I have already said, my colleagues on the Army Council fully recognise the need for improvement in this matter, and I can assure my noble friend that it is a question which is constantly before the minds of the authorities.

THE EARL OF DARTMOUTH: I am obliged to my noble friend for his Answer, but I think that in a case of this kind the local sanitary inspector should have right of entry. The noble Earl did not say whether he would grant the Return.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I gave the noble Earl in my reply the information for which he asked.

House adjourned at half-past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, at quarter-past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 9th July, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dowlais Gas Bill; Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill; Waterford Corporation and Bridge Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Dover Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

London and North Western Railway Bill [Lords] (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

South Lincolnshire Water Bill. As amended, considered. Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Sutton District Water Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill [Lords]. Read a second time and committed.

Kent Electric Power Bill [Lords] (by Order). Read a second time and committed.

Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill. Read a second time and committed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I).

Mr. TOULMIN reported from the Committee on Group I of Provisional Orders Confirmation Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had further adjourned till Thursday, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—South Suburban Gas Bill, without Amendment.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to: Bury Corporation Bill [Lords]; Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the construction of certain new works for improving the harbour of Dover; the abandonment of certain authorised works by the Dover Harbour Board; and for other purposes." [Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill [Lords].

Dover Harbour (Works, etc.) Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

CENSUS OF PRODUCTION BILL.

Petition from Huddersfield, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against. From Long Framlington; Nottingham; and, Plumtree; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petitition from Gravelly, against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petition from East Dorset, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1889 (ORDINANCE).

Copy presented, of University Court Ordinance, No. XVI (Glasgow, No. 4) (Institution of a Degree in Science in Pharmacy) [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 242.]

ARMY (CIVIL EMPLOYMENT).

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee on Civil Employment of ex soldiers and sailors, with Minutes of Evidence and Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (AGRICULTURAL RETURNS).

Copy presented, of Report on the Agricultural Returns for Great Britain, with Statistics for the United Kingdom, British Possessions, and Foreign Countries for 1905 [by Command] to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Annual Report of Proceedings under the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts, &c., for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Report of the Proceedings at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888, June 14th, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACTS, 1859 AND 1876.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated July 3rd, 1906, declaring Chinanfu to be an unhealthy place within the meaning of the Superannuation Act, 1876 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GAS AND WATERWORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with consents of certain Local and Road Authorities in the case of the Mid Kent Water Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 243.]

GAS AND WATERWORKS FACILITIES ACT, 1870.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade as to dispensing with the consent of the Chippenham Rural District Council in the case of the Corsham Gas Provisional Order [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 244.]

TREATY SERIES (No. 8) 1906.

Copy presented, of Accession of Columbia to the Convention, signed at Geneva, August 22nd, 1864, for the Amelioration of the condition of the wounded in Armies in the Field, June 7th, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS).

Address for "Returns from every County Court in England and Wales of the total number of Plaints, &c., entered in each Court from the 1st day of January to the 31st day of December, 1905, both days inclusive, distinguishing those not exceeding £20, those above £20 and not exceeding £50, those above £50 and not exceeding £100, and those by agreement over £100."

"And, of the Sittings of the County Courts in England and Wales holden before the Judges of such Courts in the year 1905 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 284, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

H.M.S. "Africa."

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the new battleship "Africa," while out for her trials, was only saved from running on the rocks at the Lizard by the engines being put full speed astern; and, if so, has any inquiry been made into the matter, and with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The engines of H.M.S. "Africa" were reversed during her trials on account of her getting into proximity to the shore in a fog. It is not proposed to make any further inquiry into the matter.

Despatches of Mails from Sliddery, Isle of Arran.

MR. LAMONT (Buteshire): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the mails from Sliddery, in the Island of Arran, now do not leave Lamlash till after 3 p.m., instead of at 11.30 a.m., as formerly; whether letters, consequently, are not delivered in Glasgow until the following day; and whether he can see his way to restoring the previous arrangement.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The alteration in the service from Sliddery referred to is the usual summer arrangement for the steamers between Lamlash and Ardrossan, and has been in operation for several years. I understand that, although the correspondence from Sliddery should reach Glasgow in time for delivery the same day, it occasionally, owing to loss of time on the way, arrives too late for the suburban post. I will make inquiry as to the possibility of effecting an improvement in the service.

Transvaal Self-Government.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government will afford opportunity for consideration by the House of any proposals they may make with a view to the establishment of responsible Government in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies before taking definite action on the Report of Sir West Ridgeway's Commission.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I must ask the hon. Member to address himself to the Prime Minister, who answered a somewhat similar Question on the 25th ultimo.[†]

Merchant Vessels and the Naval Manœuvres.

MR. BELLAIRS: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many merchant vessels of fourteen knots speed or under, and how many of over fourteen knots took part in the recent eight days naval manœuvres; and whether the insurance policy taken out covered these vessels exclusively, or whether other ships were included.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, clix., 665.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Reports of the numbers of merchant vessels taking part in the manœuvres have not yet been received. There is no speed limit named in the insurance policy.

Erection of Letter-Box at Cleggan.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can agree to the erection of a letter-box at Cleggan on the mail car route between Creeslough and Carrigart, county Donegal.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I will send the hon. Member an answer after I have made inquiry on the subject.

Winton (Bournemouth) Post Office.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the Postmaster-General if any decision has been come to as to whether the post office at Winton, Bournemouth, shall be constituted a salaried sub-office; and whether he can give any information as to when the present vacancy will be filled up.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have now decided that the post office at Winton, Bournemouth, shall remain a commission sub-office, and steps are being taken to fill the appointment.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Thomas Flanagan.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have yet made provision for Thomas Flanagan, Clonaghadoe, an evicted tenant upon the estate of Mrs. Adair, Mountmellick, Queen's County, the remaining portion of which is now before them for sale; can he say whether the Estates Commissioners are prepared to sell Flanagan's farm to the planter who has come into occupation since 1901; and, if so, how they propose to deal with the evicted tenant's claims.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I informed the hon. Member on May 17th that the Estates Commissioners had referred Mr. Flanagan's application to one of their inspectors for inquiry. His Report has not yet been received, and in the meantime the Commissioners are unable to come to a decision in the case.

Case of Pat Fahy.

MR. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Pat Fahy (Frank), who was evicted on the Clanricarde estate in 1886; whether the Estates Commissioners have made inquiry as to how the evicted farm is now held; and whether the present holder is willing to take compensation and sell to the Estates Commissioners, or what provision they intend to make for Fahy.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received from Patrick Fahy an application for reinstatement as evicted tenant. The application states that his former holding is in the occupation of another tenant. The Commissioners will have inquiry made into the case in due course. They are not aware whether the present tenant is willing to accept compensation for the surrender of the holding, but if Fahy cannot be reinstated in that holding the Commissioners will consider his case in connection with the distribution of untenanted land which they may acquire for the purpose.

Restoration of Representatives of the late Mrs. Sexton.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the tenant who is at present in occupation of the holding of the late Mrs. Kate Sexton, of Holdenstown, county Kilkenny, is a permanent tenant; if so, what steps, if any, have been taken by the Estates Commissioners to restore the representatives of Mrs. Sexton to an equivalent holding.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have no knowledge as to the tenure upon which the evicted farm in question is held by the present tenant. Miss Celia Sexton, sister-in-law of Mrs. Kate Sexton, has lodged an application for the evicted farm, and the Commissioners have had the case inquired into by one of their inspectors. They have not, however, yet ruled upon the application.

Evicted Tenants in County Kilkenny.

MR. MEAGHER: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if, owing to the discrepancy which existed in the numbers between the Returns issued subsequent to the passing of the Land Purchase Act, 1903, and the number of applications lodged by or on behalf of evicted tenants for reinstatement in the county Kilkenny, he will cause a Return to be issued of those evicted who are entitled under the Act to be reinstated, and that the necessary particulars will in each case be given so as to enable those tenants or their friends to lodge applications in due course.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that applications have been received from 141 persons seeking reinstatement as former tenants or representatives of former tenants of holdings in county Kilkenny. These applications will be inquired into and reported on by an inspector in due course; but, until each case has been ruled on by the Commissioners, they will not be in a position to particularise how many of the applicants come within Clause (d), Section 2 (1), of the Act. It appears, however, from the particulars shown in the applications themselves, that at least nine of the applicants do not come within the terms of that clause. A Return such as the hon. Member desires does not appear to be either practicable or needed.

Holding for Caldbeck on the Waring Estate.

MR. MEAGHER: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state if the Estates Commissioners have yet approached the tenant in occupation of the holding of Samuel Caldbeck, Waring's estate, Kilmanagh, county Kilkenny, who expressed his willingness to surrender the holding to Caldbeck on getting reasonable compensation; if not, what steps, if any, have been taken to provide Caldbeck with an equavalent holding.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received from Samuel Caldbeck an application for reinstatement in a holding on the Waring estate. The Commissioners have not approached the present occupier of the evicted farm, but they intend to have Caldbeck's application inquired into in due course by one of their inspectors.

Marine Works in County Mayo.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the exact position in which the scheme for connecting Malloranny and Belmullet by steamer service, under the Marine Works Act of 1902, now stands; and if he will state who or what is responsible for the delay in carrying out a scheme decided upon over three years ago.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if any of the marine schemes proposed to be carried out three years ago in the county of Mayo, under the Marine Works Act of 1902, have been abandoned; and, if so, whether it is intended to expend the money available by the dropping of these schemes in the county of Mayo where railway and other transit facilities are so much needed.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I understand that two schemes, under the Marine Works Act, for county Mayo were proposed by the late Government, one relating to harbour works at Innishlyre, and the other to a steamer service between Belmullet and Tonragee, near Mulranny. Difficulties in regard to both schemes arose while the late Government were still in office, with the result that both were suspended. His Majesty's present Government have had both schemes under consideration, as also the question of railway extension to Belmullet and of transit facilities in the district generally. The whole question is still engaging the earnest attention of the Government, but it is one of much complexity, and I do not anticipate that I shall be in a position to make a statement on the subject for some time to come.

Sale of the Perry-Knox-Gore Estate.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have approached Mrs. Perry-Knox-Gore, the owner of the Crannagh farm at Ardagh, Ballina, county Mayo (which it was proposed some time ago to dispose of by public auction), with a view to the purchase by the Commissioners of the Crannagh farm and the occupied portion of the Perry-Knox-Gore property; and, if so, with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that no proceedings for the sale of the property referred to have been instituted before them and they have not yet approached the owner upon the subject of purchase, but are now about to do so.

Meat Contracts for Troops at Belfast.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Liverpool contractor who holds the Belfast contract for meat is the person chiefly responsible for changing the condition of tender from Home-bred to Home-killed; and whether a Yorkshire farmer obtained this contract, which is supplied by an American firm.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. As regards the second, the contract was obtained by Mr. Boddy, as the hon. Member was informed on the 25th ultimo. The quality of the meat is excellent.

Pigeon Shooting in Egypt.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any general regulation with reference to the shooting of pigeons has been issued by the General in command of the British troops in Egypt: and, if so, whether he can state the terms of the regulation, and the date on which it was issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Lord Cromer in a telegram dated the 14th ultimo, addressed to my right hon. friend the Member for the Berwick-on-Tweed Division, stated that the order hitherto existing in Egypt has been that no pigeon-shooting was to take place without the consent of the Omdeh of the village, and that, since the Denshawai incident, the General Officer Commanding in Egypt was about to issue orders forbidding the shooting of pigeons in the future, but I am not aware of the terms of the order or the date of its issue.

Artillery Practice on Dartmoor.

MR. LUTTRELL (Devonshire, Tavistock): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can arrange that on August Bank Holiday there may be no artillery practice on Dartmoor.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Instructions have been issued to the commandment, artillery practice camp, Okehampton, that there is to be no firing on Easter Mondays, Whit Mondays, or August Bank Holidays.

Furnishing of Officers' Quarters—Local Tenders.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the furniture and all necessaries for the officers' quarters and mess, in Kilkenny, which were usually supplied by local firms, are now supplied from London and other outside places; and, if so, whether, in the interest of local trade and industries, he will see that the old order is reverted to, and such orders given in Kilkenny.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The furniture previously obtained locally was presumably that purchased by officers privately before quarters and messes were furnished at the public expense. Furniture is now obtained by public tender and supplied as Government equipment to quarters and messes. I do not propose to change the system now in force.

Australian Tinned Meat.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Colonial Office have received any representations as to the position of the tinned meat trade in New South Wales; and whether he can say if he has any official information that the system of inspection in operation in Australia is so rigorous and careful that the occurrence of any abuse is impossible, and that consequently there has been no complaint whatever as to the excellence of the article snpplied by the Australian trade.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Since the hon. Member's Question was put to me on July 2nd, a letter has been received from the Agent-General for New South Wales pointing out that special care is exercised by the New South Wales Government that only healthy beasts are slaughtered for food, and both in freezing and canning works every precaution is taken to ensure that cleanly methods are adopted. All animals intended for human food are, first of all, inspected alive in the sale yards by Government veterinary experts. These inspectors are either veterinary surgeons or have passed a thorough examination in the detection of diseases both in live stock and meat. Subsequently the carcases are inspected in the slaughter-houses which are also under Government control. In transit, in shops, and other places, frequent inspections are made, and these extend in every instance to the whole premises and to all meats or parts of the carcase. Not only this, but the utensils and appliances, in addition to the blood, offal, etc., are inspected, and were any breach of the regulations regarding cleanliness to occur, the licence to such premises would be at once withdrawn. The Government inspectors have to make weekly reports with particulars of the numbers of cattle slaughtered. Not only has every slaughtering establishment to be licensed but every person intending to slaughter cattle for food has to give twelve hours notice to the inspector to enable him to be present, a penalty of £5 being inflicted for every head of cattle which has been slaughtered without proper notice having been given. The laws against slaughtering for food of any cattle that are in any way diseased are strict; and if an inspector finds the milt or spleen of any slaughtered animal to be diseased, he causes the entire carcase to be removed and destroyed under penalty of a fine from £10 to £50. Any person taking such beast to slaughter is liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour, and any one attempting to sell such diseased meat is liable to a long term of imprisonment. In the establishments where meat is being prepared for canning, etc., the regulations are especially strict. I desire to correct a mistake which was unfortunately made in my Answer to the hon. Member's Question on July 2nd. I then stated that no tinned meat was exported from New South Wales to this country. I should have stated that no boneless meat was exported. Tinned meat is imported from New South Wales and also from Queensland in considerable quantities and in smaller quantities from South Australia and Victoria. I understand that in the principal works in Australia where the preserved meat industry is carried on the beasts are killed purely and solely for preserving purposes, and only the finest parts of them go into the tins.

South African Custom Duty on Skimmed Condensed Milk.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that, by the action of the South African Customs Convention, certain new duties were simultaneously passed and became law throughout British South Africa as from mid-day on May 25th last, and that a duty of 6d. per pound was placed on skimmed condensed milk which had hitherto entered South Africa under a duty of 2s. per case, valued at 12s. 6d., whereas the new duty imposed is 24s. per case; that the trade in this article, almost wholly in the hands of British merchants, averaging from 30,000 to 40,000 cases per month, is in danger of destruction, and that, contrary to the established practice, no previous intimation was given of the proposed increase of duty, and no provision made for the clearance at the old duty of shipments in transit, approximating 35,000 cases, which will be prohibited entrance except at the new duty; and, if so, will he use his influence with the Colonial Governments to permit shipments in transit at the time of the imposition of the extra duty to be admitted at the old rate.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Secretary of State is aware of the increase of duty alluded to by the hon. Member. Representations as to the hardship of collecting the new duty on cargoes in transit were communicated to the South African Governments, and collection was postponed till July 1st subject to sufficient proof being given that importations prior to that date were kept within the limits of contracts entered into before May 25th on which date the increased duties provided for by the new Customs Convention came into force.

The Rajah of Sarawak and the Sultan of Brunei and the Foreign Office.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, when desiring to bring fully to the notice of His Majesty's

Government the subject of the relations between the Government of His Highness the Rajah of Sarawak and that of the Sultan of Brunei, both under British protection, any question, or any application for information, shall be made to the Foreign Office or the Colonial Office.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) All questions arising in connection with the relations between the States of Sarawak and Brunei are dealt with by the Foreign Office.

Temporary Second Division Clerks Appointed to Irish Government Departments.

MR. FIELD : To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can give the number of second division clerks who were appointed temporarily during the last five years in the first instance to Irish Government Departments ; and whether he can give the number of these second division clerks that were afterwards made permanent in the Departments to which they were originally assigned for temporary duty.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) During the period July 1st, 1901, to June 30th, 1906, I am informed the forty-four second division clerks were assigned for temporary duty in Irish Government Departments. Of these, twelve were afterwards made permanent in the Departments to which they were originally assigned.

Excise Department—Promotion to Supervisorships.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what is the average age of officers of Excise when called upon to attend the examination for supervisorship, and what proportion of those who present themselves secure promotion; whether in view of the course of study which success at the examination entails, the Board of Inland Revenue will adopt the course introduced by the Board of Customs in similar circumstances and give six months notice of the date of the examination, and at the same time indicate the officers who will be called upon to attend; whether he can state when the next examination will be held, and also say how far down the seniority list of first class officers the summons to attend will be extended; and whether he will give instruction that so far as is practicable future examinations, both for the supervisorship and the inspectorship, be held in the spring so as to avoid the necessity for a course of close study during the summer months.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) (1) The average age of officers attending the examination for the supervisorship is forty-four. (2) Roughly speaking about one-third of the number of candidates are passed. (3) As long a notice as possible is given of the date when the next examination for the supervisorship will be held. In view of the uncertainty of requirements, as resulting from the vacancies that occur, it would be difficult to give as much as six months notice, or to indicate the officers who will be called upon to attend. (4) So far as the Board of Inland Revenue can tell at present, an examination for the supervisorship will be held early in the spring of next year, but it is impossible to state how far down the seniority list the summons to attend will be extended. (5) I understand it would not be practicable, as a general rule, to hold the two examinations in the spring of the year.

Inspection of Imported Food.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will consider the advisability of introducing a public measure to compel all port sanitary or borough council authorities to inspect imported food, including tinned products.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. I have now under consideration the expediency of proposing legislation for the purpose of amending the law in relation to food inspection.

Railway Rates and Facilities.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will consider the advisability of extending the powers of the Railway Department of the Board of Trade in regard to complaints by individual traders, respecting rates, facilities, and contracting out of liabilities previous to an appeal to the Railway Commission; and whether any arrangement can be made to cheapen the cost of proceedings before the Railway Commission.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The whole matter is engaging my careful attention, but I am not at present able to make any statement on the subject. I am fully aware of the desirability of securing as cheap and expeditious a means of dealing with traders' complaints as the circumstances of the case permit.

Distribution of Grants under the Education Bill.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): To ask the President of the Board of Education, the financial Resolution for the Education Bill having been passed, if he can now give any indication as to the probable distribution of the money.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) As stated by me on the introduction of the Education Bill, and in Answers to various Questions put to me since then in the House, the general principle upon which the Board of Education will proceed in the ultimate distribution of the new grant will be to have regard both (a) to the actual increase of local burden consequent upon the Bill, and (b) to the amount of the education burden in the area. In regard to the first of these points the Government are of opinion, as I stated on April 9th, that it is not possible to lay down any detailed scheme for the distribution of the grant until some reliable estimate can be formed of the probable additional burden accruing in individual areas through the operation of the Bill, and this cannot be obtained until we have had some experience of the arrangements that are made under the Bill between local education authorities and the owners or the trustees of voluntary schools. But there can be no doubt that, taking the country as a whole, the sum named in the Bill will considerably more than cover the total liabilities that can reasonably be expected to accrue to the local authorities generally in respect of the new burden of the structural repairs of those voluntary schools which are taken over, and in respect of sums paid by way of rent or otherwise on the taking over of those schools, or in the shape of new annual charges of sinking fund and interest for the erection of any new council schools that may be erected in lieu of existing voluntary schools. In regard to the second of the two points named above, it is clear that any scheme of distribution of the Exchequer grant, which is to have regard in some equitable manner to the total burden borne by a locality in respect of elementary education, must involve some readjustment of the existing Exchequer grants in aid of elementary education. For these reasons the Chancellor of the Exchequer has decided that there should be a comprehensive scheme of allocation of all State grants in aid of the local burden in respect of elementary education throughout England and Wales. An amalgamation of the existing grants for elementary education, which are now threefold, annual grant, free grant, and special aid grant, and are paid on various very complicated bases and at different dates, is, on other grounds, eminently desirable; and the Board have, for some time past, had it in contemplation to attempt some such administrative reform as this, and also to reform the extremely tangled scheme of "school years," delayed payments, and quarterly instalments, at present attaching to the grants generally. From these various considerations, therefore, the Government are of opinion that the best mode of dealing with the matter is to prepare a scheme by which all existing grants for elementary education, together with the new grant of £1,000,000 sterling, shall be newly distributed, having regard especially to the two points hereinbefore named, and that, as such a scheme cannot, for the reasons above stated, be prepared until information is available as to the arrangements made respecting transfers of schools under the Bill, it shall be made the subject of a Bill to be introduced next year.

Schools promoted by Persons other than Local Education Authorities.

MR. WALROND (Devonshire, Tiverton): To ask the President of the Board of Education what is the number and what the religious character of the schools promoted by persons other than local education authorities, and sanctioned by the Board of Education under Section 8 of the Education Act of 1902.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The number and religious character of the new voluntary schools promoted by persons other than local education authorities, and sanctioned by the Board of Education under Section 8 of the Education Act, 1902, is—forty-five Church of England; fourteen Roman Catholic; two Wesleyan; four other undenominational. This is irrespective of certain enlargements which have been sanctioned.

Men Employed in Royal Dockyards.

MR. BELLAIRS: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what has been approximately the maximum and minimum number of men employed in the Royal Dockyards since 1900, inclusive; and what is the approximate number contemplated by the Admiralty at the conclusion of the present financial year; or, if this figure cannot be given, whether he can state the number now employed.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The maximum number of men employed since 1900 is 35,676, and the minimum 27,000, which is the number borne at the present time. The numbers to be borne at the end of the year have not been determined.

Application for Allotments at Achscrabster—Expense Involved.

MR. R. L. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that in a recent application under the Allotments Act for land (extending to thirty acres, and valued at £15 11s. per annum), at Achscrabster, in the county of Caithness, the legal and other expenses connected with the valuation of this small piece of land were as follows: Arbiter's fee and expenses, £17 1s. 5d.; fee and expenses to the clerk to the Reference, £47 2s. 6d.; cost of the solicitors for the proprietor, £25 18s. 1d.; compensation to the tenants (£15 6s. 5d.), and their expenses (£4 2s. 5d.) together £19 8s. 10d.; cost of the solicitors representing the parish council, £3 5s. 8d.; outlays incurred by the county clerk, £21 12s. 1d.; making a total of £134 8s. 7d.; and whether the Government will introduce legislation to amend the Allotments Act so as to make the incurring of such expenses impossible in the future.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The expenses connected with the Achscrabster allotments are correctly reported by the hon. Member. The rent, however, is £18 9s. 6d. per annum, not £15 11s. Undoubtedly the total amount of the expenses is out of all proportion to the magnitude of this transaction, and a simpler and cheaper procedure is necessary to any large extension of the allotments system. Until Parliament has had an opportunity of considering the Bill amending the Crofters Act, which is now under preparation, I am unable to give any pledge as to legislation.

Payments under the Agricultural Rates Act.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received copies of a Resolution from the Vaynor and Penderyn Rural District Council, recommending that the payments made under the Agricultural Rates Act to spending authorities should be based on the average of the rates collected during the three years immediately preceding years to that in which payments are made, and not, as now, on the one year basis; and whether he intends taking any action in connection with the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have received copies of several Resolutions from local authorities to the effect stated in the Question. The Act requires that the annual payments made under it shall be based on the amount of the rates raised during the year 1895-6. I could not undertake to propose legislation to alter it in this respect.

Assessment and Taxation of Coal.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received a petition from the Merthyr Board of Guardians praying that a committee of inquiry be set up to report upon the present system of assessing coal raised in the country for the purpose of rating and to fix a national basis for assessment purposes, and what action he purposes taking.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have received a copy of a Resolution passed by the Merthyr Tydvil guardians on this subject, and I am aware that complaints have been made as to the different methods adopted of ascertaining the rateable value of coal mines. The Royal Commission on Local Taxation referred to the matter in their final Report, and recommended special means for dealing with the valuation of these and some other properties. I do not think it necessary that a committee should be appointed, as suggested by the guardians, but the mode of valuing coal mines will not be lost sight of when the Government are considering the subject of valuation.

American Beef Companies and Income Tax.

MR. FIELD: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that certain American beef companies who import meat into this country state they do so at a loss and pay no Income-Tax upon their turnover; and whether he will institute inquiries regarding this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The matter is one to the importance of which the Board of Inland Revenue are fully alive, and every care is taken by them to secure the assessment of the companies to Income-Tax on their true English profits. In the case of an appeal by an American firm against an Inland Revenue assessment in 1903, the firm in question succeeded in proving to the satisfaction of the District Commissioners, by means of a full disclosure of the accounts of the whole of their business, that the trading of the dressed beef department, from which the bulk of the English trade is drawn, had resulted in a loss.

Great Southern and Western Railway and Carriage of Exhibits from Agricultural Shows.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Great Southern and Western Railway Company of Ireland, disregarding the practice prevailing with the English railway companies to charge agricultural machines, implements, and other exhibits transferred from one agricultural show to another, at half rates at owner's risk, if such articles are certified by the exhibitor to be unsold, charge in respect of such articles full rates; and whether he is prepared to use his influence to put an end to this treatment in the interests of agriculture.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Department of Agriculture are informed that the arrangements as to charges for the carriage by railway of agricultural machines, implements, and other exhibits, from shows in Great Britain differ somewhat from those which apply under like circumstances in Ireland. In England it appears that such exhibits are charged at full rates going to shows and at half rates when returning, upon being certified as unsold. Unsold exhibits conveyed from one show to another are charged at half rates. In Ireland exhibits going to shows are charged at full rates, as in Great Britain, but are carried back free if certified as unsold. The traffic from show to show is charged at full rates in Ireland. The Department are not aware that exception has been taken by any Irish exhibitor to this procedure as adopted on the Great Southern and Western Railway, but it would seem that an English firm, which some time ago exhibited implements at an Irish show, objected to being charged full rates when the goods were carried by railway to another show in Ireland. Traffic of this kind from show to show in Ireland is stated to be very small, and the Department have no information to show that Irish exhibitors are desirous that the system of charging adopted by British railway companies should be substituted for that now in operation in Ireland. The Department are also given to understand that the charges for the carriage of agricultural machines and implements as a whole are lower in Ireland than in Great Britain. In these circumstances it does not appear necessary to make any special representation to the Irish railway companies on the subject.

Irish Agricultural Organisation Association.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the promised Return, giving detailed particulars of payments by the Department of Agriculture to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Association, and to officials of that organisation, will be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am now prepared to give this Return if the hon. Member should formally move for it.

MR. DELANY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many members of the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society have been nominated by the department to membership of the Agricultural Council and Board of Agriculture, respectively; and whether he will say who was the founder of the Agricultural Organisation Society.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that of the thirty-four members of the present Council of Agriculture nominated by the Department, eight are members of the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, and that of the four members of the Agricultural Board nominated by the Department, three are members of the Society. The Society was founded by Sir Horace Plunkett.

Construction of a Boat-Slip at Maghery Bay.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a memorial from fishermen and others asking for the construction of a boat-slip at Maghery Bay, between Burtonport and Portnoo, county Donegal; and whether he is prepared to accede to the request of the memorialists.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The memorial in question represented the need for a boat-slip or harbour at Maghery Bay to accommodate a large number of luggers and small fishing boats. The memorial has been placed before the Congested Districts Board, who have decided to postpone consideration of the project, as the probable cost of a suitable work would be beyond the means at their disposal. The Board understand that no harbour that would be safe for luggers in bad weather could be constructed at such an exposed place under a cost of £10,000, and probably this sum would be largely exceeded. Even a slip, with protecting breakwater which would be useful for small boats, would cost about £3,000.

Bank of England Stock.

MR. FIELD: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of the facts that the value of the Bank of England stock has of late years declined from 342 to 284, or equal to £60, and that the values of limited bank shares have hardly depreciated during the same period owing to the existence of Leeman's Bank Act of 1867, which protects these stocks from bear operations, what steps does His Majesty's Government intend to take to protect the Bank of England stock and other trust securities; and whether the Government will adopt the same effectual legislative measures to apply to all these stocks as Leeman's Act does with limited bank shares, in order to stop a continuance of the systems of bull and bear financial gambling operations in fictitious shares, with the object of protecting the interests of bonâ fide shareholders.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) I doubt if Leeman's Act produces all the effect that the hon. Member attributes to it, and I am not prepared to take the action that he suggests.

Extension of Labourers (Ireland) Act to Artizans of Urban Districts.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received from the Galway Urban District Council and other local bodies in Ireland copies of Resolutions asking the Government to extend the provisions of the Labourers (Ireland) Bill to the labourers and artizans of urban districts, so that the same facilities be granted to urban councils which are proposed to be granted to rural district councils; and, if so, will he say what action the Government propose taking.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) Resolutions to the effect mentioned have been received. In reply to the concluding inquiry I beg to refer to my Answer to the similar Question of the hon. Member for West Kerry on June 21st.†

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

British Naval Training.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the attention of the Board has been called to the Report made by the Italian Minister of Marine to the Chamber of Deputies in which the new scheme of naval training in the British Navy is condemned; and whether he will lay upon the Table a translation of such parts of the Report as deal with the new scheme of naval training.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): My attention has been called to the memorandum and I have taken steps to obtain a copy of it, but until this is received I must defer replying to the last part of the hon. Member's Question.

Army Route Marching.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what has been the result of the investigations he instituted into the circumstances of the march of the first brigade of the Buffs from Lydd to Dover, which was alleged to have resulted in several casualties of a serious nature.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 374.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The report of this case which has been received shows that the man who died in Dover hospital from valvular disease of the heart on April 11th did not march with the detachment, but was sent from Lydd to Dover by train on the 10th. The marches were as follows: April 10th, Lydd to Shorncliffe 16 miles. Halts of 5, 10, 10 and 20 minutes respectively. Weather cool, N.E. wind. No men fell out. April 11th, Shorncliffe to Dover Citadel. Left Shorncliffe 8.55 a.m., arrived Citadel 12.15 p.m., distance about 9 miles. Halts of 5, 10, 10 and 5 minutes respectively. Weather hot and close, S.W. wind. A private fell out near Dover Rifle Range after descending a long decline, and was sent in by a cart to Station hospital, Western Heights, where he died the following morning. He had two years' service, had never served abroad, had done the previous day's march without apparent fatigue, and had not complained of feeling unwell before starting. The General Officer Commanding is of opinion that the marches were not of excessive length, that they were carried out at the pace laid down in Regulations for large bodies of troops, that the halts were amply sufficient, and that care was taken that the men obtained food and refreshment on the march. The conclusion to be drawn is that the man referred to died from the effects of the abnormal heat wave, to the effects of which he had a predisposed susceptibility. This is the opinion of the Army Medical Officer and is borne out by the fact that no other men of the detachment fell out except one man with the baggage guard. Two men also reported sore feet the following day, but none of these went to hospital. I am satisfied that the officers of this battalion and the army medical officers were not in any way neglectful of the comfort and welfare of their men, and I much regret that the unfortunate death of this young soldier should have given rise to the exaggerated reports in the Press that two men had died as the result of the march, that numbers of men had fallen out, and that there were numerous sufferers in hospital.

Bloemfontein Garrison.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R. Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the deficiency in transport in connection with the Bloemfontein garrison; whether he is aware that when the Artillery brigade goes into camp the rest of the force are practically left without any transport at all; that such waggons as are available are of different patterns and not interchangeable in their parts; and that one battalion of infantry has no mobilisation equipment whatever; and whether he will take steps to remedy such deficiencies at an early date.

MR. HALDANE: There is no deficiency of transport in connection with the Bloemfontein garrison, and the hon. Member must be under a misapprehension as to the rest of the force being left without transport when the Artillery Brigade goes into camp. The transport wagons are the local pattern buck wagons and are in every way satisfactory. All the Infantry battalions in South Africa are in process of being completed with mobilisation equipment.

Reservists in the Brigade of Guards.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the number of reservists belonging to each of the four regiments of the brigade of Guards.

MR. HALDANE: The strength of the Army Reserve of the Brigade of Guards on July 1st, 1906, was as follows:—

Regiment.	Section "A"	Section "B"	Section "D"	Total.
Grenadiers	39	2,487	347	2,873
Coldstreams	84	1,970	189	2,243
Scots	55	1,331	207	1,593
Irish	45	420	1	466
Total	223	6,208	744	7,175

Cost of a Grenadier Guard.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the average annual cost per man of the rank and file to the Grenadier Guards, taking men with the colours and in the reserve together for the purpose of striking the average.

*MR. HALDANE: The average annual effective cost of the rank and file of the Grenadier Guards, on the lines indicated, is about £29 10s. per man.

Cost of a Battalion of the Guards.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the annual cost of maintenance of a battalion of the Guards including and excluding reservists, respectively.

*MR. HALDANE: The annual effective cost of maintenance of a battalion of Foot Guards (other than the battalion of Irish Guards which has a specially high establishment) is approximately £59,000, including a share of the depôt, but not including reservists. The cost of the reservists of the Foot Guards, exclusive of the Irish Guards, is at present about £7,000 per battalion. The reserve of the Irish Guards has not yet attained its full proportions.

Cost of Army Maintenance..

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the annual cost of upkeep of the following units; a field battery, Royal Artillery, on lower establishment, a battery of the Lancashire Militia, Field Artillery Brigade, and a horse artillery battery of the Honourable Artillery Company.

*MR. HALDANE: The annual effective cost of upkeep of a battery of Royal Field Artillery on lower establishment is £13,000, and that of a battery of the Lancashire Field Artillery Militia £6,500. The cost to the public of a horse artillery battery of the Honourable Artillery Company is approximately £1,100; but I am not in a position to state what further expenditure may take place from the funds of the Company.

Winter Training of Militia Regiments.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can now state the names of the Militia battalions with which the experiment of training recruits for six winter months is to be tried.

*MR. HALDANE: The following are the Militia battalions selected for experimental training of six months (for recruits) and of six weeks for trained men.

Battalion.		Head Quarters.
	England.	
3rd Battalion	East Kent Regiment	Canterbury.
5th „	Royal Warwickshire Regiment	Warwick.
7th „	Royal Fusiliers Regiment	Hounslow.
4th „	Somersetshire Light Infantry	Taunton.
3rd „	Bedfordshire Regiment	Bedford.
3rd „	Yorkshire Regiment	Richmond.
6th „	Lanarkshire Fusiliers	Bury.
4th „	Shropshire Light Infantry	Hereford.
3rd „	Loyal North Lancashire Regiment	Preston.
3rd „	Oxfordshire Light Infantry	High Wycombe.
7th „	King's Royal Rifle Corps	Barnet.
3rd „	North Staffordshire Regiment	Lichfield.
3rd „	York and Lancashire Regiment	Pontefract.
	Ireland.	
4th Battalion	Royal Irish Rifles	Belfast.
5th „	Connaught Rangers	Boyle.
3rd „	Royal Munster Fusiliers	Kinsale.
4th „	Royal Dublin Fusiliers	Dublin.
	Scotland.	
4th Battalion	Scottish Rifles	Hamilton.
3rd „	Gordon Highlanders	Aberdeen.

And one other not yet definitely selected.

Australian Mail Service.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government have considered any fresh arrangement for the Australian mail service to come into force when the present contracts terminate?

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The Postmaster-General has invited tenders for the performance of the England-Australia mail service after January 31st, 1908, but the tenders have not yet been received.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked if the agreement reported in to-day's paper as having been come to by the Federal Government in any way affected the contract that might be entered into by the Home Government.

MR. CHURCHILL: I must ask for notice of that Question.

General Botha and the Chinese Coolies.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Secretary of State has received a letter from General Botha asking the Government to take drastic action to bring to an end the employment of Chinese in the Transvaal gold mines: and, if, so, what reply has been given to the letter; and whether the correspondence will be included in the forthcoming Blue-book on South African affairs.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has received a letter from General Botha urging that unless the outrages committed by the Chinese coolies can be effectively stopped the labourers should be repatriated in the interests of public tranquillity. The reply to this letter is on its way to South Africa and will be included in the forthcoming Blue-book.

White Labour in the Transvaal Mines.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how many white men (approximately) were employed in the Transvaal mines when the Government took office; and how many are now in employment there.

MR. CHURCHILL: The number of white men employed in the Transvaal gold mines when the Government took office was about 18,150: the number employed on May 31st was 18,309.

Kaffirs in the Transvaal Mines.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state the number of Kaffirs employed in the mines in the Transvaal on April 30th, 1906; the number of Kaffirs employed in the said mines before the war broke out; the number of Kaffirs, other than those employed in the mines, employed in the Transvaal, whether by the Public Works Department, the military authorities, in domestic service, in trade, or otherwise, at the present time; the number similarly employed before the war.

MR. CHURCHILL: 93,739 was the number of Kaffirs employed in the Transvaal Gold Mines on April 30th. There is some uncertainty as to the numbers prior to the war. The report of the Transvaal Labour Commission quotes the Government Mining Engineer's statement that 107,827 were employed on gold mines in July, 1899; of these 91,484 were at work. Subsequently the Mining Department published the figures 107,482 as representing the coloured labour for the Witwatersrand Gold Mines with a statement that the figures for other districts were not known. The number of Kaffirs in other employment than Gold Mining in Labour Districts on April 30th appears to have been between 85,000 and 90,000. I am not in a position to give the numbers before the war, but the numbers in other employment were much fewer then than now.

MR. PAUL (Northampton): Has there been any change in the rate of wages since the war?

MR. CHURCHILL: There was a distinct and serious reduction of the rate of wages paid to the Kaffirs in the Witwatersrand area after the war, but I am informed that the rate of wages has now been raised to the pre-war level.

Outrages by Chinese Coolies.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the number of outrages committed by Chinese coolies during the months of March, April, May, and June; and how many Chinese coolies are at present in prison in the Transvaal as a result of crimes, outrages, and other breaches of the Law.

MR. CHURCHILL: The following are the returns of convictions for March, April and May:—

	March.	April.	May.
Common assault	55	73	48
Assault with intent	12	6	4
Murder	0	17	6
Housebreaking by day	8	27	20
Housebreaking by night	1	22	1
	76	145	79

The returns for June are not yet available. The number of Chinese coolies in prison on May 31st was 1,311.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) asked whether the Government had published a Return of the outrages committed by natives during the present year.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir. I do not think the figures are available with anything like the same degree of accuracy in regard to the natives. These returns involve great expense and trouble. We endeavour to supply Returns for the information of this House when the House calls for them. There is a considerable proportion of crime among the Kaffir population.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Will the hon. Gentleman lay the information before the House?

MR. CHURCHILL: If the hon. Gentleman desires to have a Return he is fully acquainted with the proper procedure.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): Has the Government any information of any other working population one-fiftieth of whom are in gaol?

MR. CHURCHILL: I must ask for notice of that Question.

South African Labour Party and Coolie Repatriation.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that a meeting has been held at Pretoria under the auspices of the Labour Party, and also a mass meeting at Bramfontein, at which Resolutions were passed calling for the repatriation of the Chinese coolies; and whether, in view of these Resolutions, he proposes to take any action to give effect to the growing feeling in favour of such a policy.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Resolution of the meeting of the Transvaal Independent Labour Party at Pretoria of May 9th, which has been received by the Secretary of State, is a Resolution in support of the action of His Majesty's Government with regard to Chinese repatriation. I have not received the Bramfontein Resolution.

Murder by Natives in Natal.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Colonial Office has received any confirmation of the alleged discovery of the mutilated corpse of a white man in Mesini's kraal.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir, a telegram from the Governor states:—"Body found of white civilian bicyclist foully murdered by Mesini's order. Head, arm, and leg missing and trunk disfigured by most horrible mutilations.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Will the hon. Gentleman tell us how many mutilated bodies of Kaffirs have been found in the kraals?

[No Answer was returned.]

The Swadeshi Movement in Bengal.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Swadeshi movement in Bengal has led to the importation from Austria, Germany, Belgium, and other non-British sources, of Foreign goods which are stamped by Indian Native importers with the Swadeshi stamp, and sold, in preference to better goods of the same descriptions, which were formerly supplied from Britain.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): I have seen a statement to this effect in the newspapers, but I have no definite information as to the extent to which this dishonest practice prevails, or the degree of success attending it. Imports of British goods into India during the twelve months ending March 31st last show no falling off, but on the contrary a considerable increase on those of previous years.

Outrages by Indian Natives.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the natives of India who recently assaulted Mr. Earle, a British planter in the Ranikhet district, and left him for dead, have been brought to justice; and what was the result of the trial of certain natives of India for the murder of Mr. Goss, a British planter, of Darjeeling.

MR. MORLEY: I have no official information as to these cases, but I believe that the first case is still under investigation, and that in the second case an appeal is pending against the sentence of transportation for life which was passed on a servant of the deceased who was convicted of the murder.

Indian Official Publications.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the fact that the annual publication known as "The Moral and Material Progress of India" contains a great deal of matter that has already appeared in official publications, and that much of the information contained in it is out of date before it appears; and whether, under these circumstances, he will consider the desirability of repealing the section in Act 21 and 22 Vic., under which this publication is issued, so as to save the expense now annually incurred.

MR. MORLEY: The wording of the Act, under which these Reports have to be laid annually before Parliament, shows that they were intended to present in a convenient shape information collected from other Reports already published, and to form a permanent record, systematically arranged and easily referred to, of the administration of Indian affairs. I have reason to think that they fulfil this purpose, and I do not as at present advised see any reason for repealing the section quoted in the Question.

Indian Viceregal Council and the Budget Debate.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has yet communicated with the Government of India with regard to the importance of allowing more time for the annual Budget debate in the Viceregal Council; and what steps have been taken in the matter.

MR. MORLEY: I am discussing this subject with the Government of India, and I can assure my hon. friend that I am sensible of its importance.

British Garrison in Egypt.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if there is any intention to further reduce the British garrison in Egypt, in view of the fanatical feeling existing in that country and in the North of Africa generally.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury, for Sir EDWARD GREY): The Answer is in the negative.

Dalny.

MR. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information showing that the Manchurian port of Dalny is closed to all except Japanese goods.

MR. RUNCIMAN: His Majesty's Ambassador at Tokio has been informed by the Japanese Government that pending the completion of the necessary arrangements, Dalny is not yet open to foreign vessels. There is, however, no discrimination of any kind in favour of Japanese merchandise. Foreign merchandise is as free to enter Dalny as Japanese articles, and foreigners availing themselves of the opportunities afforded are as free as Japanese to send their merchandise thither. The coastal junk trade with Dalny has been reopened, and the export and import duties in the leased territory have been abolished since June 30th.

Macedonia Administration.

MR. GOOCH (Bath): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps His Majesty's Government intend to take in view of the failure of the Ottoman Government to provide for the expenses of administration and the payment of salaries in Macedonia.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Sir EDWARD GREY): In reply to this Question I must refer the hon. Member to the statement made by me in the debate in this House on the 5th instant,† and to the Answer to the hon. Member for Northamptonshire.

Turkish Reforms.

MR. LEIF JONES: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in the event of the renewal of negotiations for the increase of the Turkish Customs duties, His Majesty's Government will consider the advisability of obtaining more adequate guarantees for effective reform.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Sir EDWARD GREY): The attitude of His Majesty's Government on this subject was explained in my speech in this House on the 5th instant,† to which I have nothing to add. As my hon. friend will have gathered from what was said on Thursday, what is most urgently required to secure reform is that the present deficits should be supplied. This and other conditions necessary to maintain and carry on the reforms are now being considered.

Macedonia Gendarmerie.

MR. LEIF JONES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps His Majesty's Government intend to take in view of the non-compliance of the Porte with the demands relating to the Macedonian Gendarmerie, that were presented in March and renewed in June.

MR. RUNCIMAN: His Majesty's Government intend to press for the fulfilment of the demands relating to the Macedonian Gendarmerie in conjunction with the other Powers.

Khanikin—Kermanshah Railway Project.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information in regard to a German syndicate having presented an application to the Persian Government for a railway concession from Khanikin, over the Turco-Persian frontier, to Kermanshah in Persian territory.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I have nothing to add to the Answer given to the hon. Member for the Montgomery District on June 13th, to the effect that I could give no information.

Turco-Persian Boundary Commission.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in a position to give the date and place of meeting of the Turco-Persian Boundary Commission in regard to Pasova.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Answer to this Question is in the negative.

Russia and the Aland Islands.

MR. HICKS BEACH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what steps the Government intend taking to enforce the Treaty of Paris with regard to the Russian troops in the Aland Islands.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I have nothing to add to my reply to the hon. Member for the North Blackpool Division of Lancashire on the 28th ultimo, to the effect that we have no information to show that the Russian Government contemplate any breach of the provisions of the Treaty of Paris by fortifying the Aland Islands, or maintaining or creating Military or Naval establishments there.

Visit of the British Fleet to Russian Ports.

MR. HICKS BEACH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Channel Fleet will pay a visit to a Russian port before compensation has been paid for all the British merchant vessels sunk during the late war.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I have nothing to add to the statements which I have already made in this House on the subject of the visit.‡

---

† See Col. 324, *et seq.*

‡ See col. 327, *et seq.*

Ethiopian Railway.

MR. HICKS BEACH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government is giving any pledge to the French Government in connection with the Ethiopian Railway in Abyssinia which will stop a railway being built in British Somaliland from Berbera to Harrar *via* Hargeisa.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The agreement has been provisionally initialled, but will not be signed until the Emperor Menelik has had an opportunity of expressing his views. In the meantime, no statement can be made on the subject.

Workmen's Compensation—Southwark Case.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a recent case under the Workmen's Compensation Act, in which the judge of the Southwark County Court reduced an allowance to an injured workman of 15s. per week to 1d., in order to induce him to undergo a surgical operation, which his employers stated would, in their opinion, have the effect of remedying his injuries; and, if so, whether he will consider the desirableness of introducing in the Bill now before Parliament such provision as will relieve an injured workman from the necessity of incurring the risk of further injuries by undergoing, at the dictation of his employers, surgical operations to which he objects.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I am informed by the deputy judge by whom this case was decided that he reduced the allowance to the workman, not for the reason suggested by the hon. Member, but because he was satisfied on the evidence that the workman was at the time quite well and able to work. The Act does not empower an employer to require a workman to undergo any surgical operation, and I see no reason, therefore, to introduce any Amendment such as the hon. Member indicates.

MR. BOTTOMLEY: I beg to give notice I will ask the Prime Minister if he will grant an early day to consider the conduct of this extraordinary Judge.

Danger of Tram Ticket Collections—Hammersmith Fatality.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the inquest and verdict at Hammersmith upon Frederick Barnard, who was killed by a vehicle at Beadon Hill; will he say what was the age of the deceased and whether he was in the act of collecting tram and 'bus tickets; and will he say how many serious accidents and deaths have been brought about by this advertising device since its inception; and whether the Government will take the necessary steps to put an end to this dangerous form of advertising.

*MR. GLADSTONE: Frederick Barnard, a child of four years, was killed at Hammersmith by a vehicle while picking up tram tickets in the roadway. Two fatal accidents and seven resulting in personal injury have to the knowledge of the police been brought about by this cause within the Metropolitan Police District. The question of the legality of these advertisements is now under consideration and will, it is hoped, be decided at an early date on a case stated by a magistrate.

Case of Mrs. Ellen Hitchcock.

MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to the remarks of Mr. d'Eyncourt, the stipendiary magistrate at Clerkenwell, in dismissing a charge preferred by the police against Mrs. Helen Hitchcock of behaving in a disorderly manner and using obscene language in Upper Street, Islington, on June 26th, and particularly to the magistrate's comment on the alteration of the charge from one of solicitation to one of disorderly behaviour; and whether he will cause an inquiry to be made into the action of the police constable who arrested Mrs. Hitchcock and of the inspector who took the charge at the police station.

*MR. GLADSTONE: My attention has been called to the case, but I find that there was no alteration in the charge; what the magistrate pointed out was that from the first the charge was not one of solicitation, but of disorderly conduct. (A charge of solicitation can only be brought against a person known to be a prostitute, which was not the case here.) The magistrate tells me that though he discharged the woman, he believes the officer acted honestly and from no improper motive; and the Commissioner of Police, who has made inquiry into the facts, reports that he is of opinion that the officer was not to blame. I think, however, and in this opinion the Commissioner concurs, that the case is one that should be referred to the Royal Commission.

Case of Edward Guerin.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether Edward Guerin is a British subject; and whether he is to be extradited to France on the charge of being convicted of larceny in that country.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: Edward Guerin has been committed to prison to await extradition to France. He has, however, applied for a writ of habeas corpus and a rule nisi has been granted. The question of his nationality will be decided on that application.

Vaccination Exemption Certificates.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that the county magistrates in the West Riding Court, Skyrack Division, at Leeds, on June 26th, refused to entertain the case of an applicant, Mr. Samuel Priestly, for a certificate of exemption from vaccination on the ground that the certificate of the child's birth produced, and obtained from the local registrar for 3d., was not sufficient, and demanded, as a preliminary to trying the case, that a birth certificate costing 2s. 6d. should be produced; and will he take steps to obtain some alteration in the procedure at this Court.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: The 3d. certificate mentioned in the Question is not a certificate of birth, but only a certificate of registration. As I informed the hon. Member for the Wycombe Division in answer to his Question on March 28th, it has been held by the High Court that magistrates are entitled to require a certificate of birth, unless some reason is shown why it cannot be given. I have no authority to intervene in the matter.

Mr. BRACE (Glamorganshire, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention had been called to the refusals of the Porth, Glamorganshire, magistrates upon two occasions to grant a certificate of exemption from vaccination for the child of Mr. William Griffiths, 71, Penygraig Road, Penygraig; and whether, in face of the fact that Mr. Griffiths had been prevented from making an application at the Ystrad Court on June 18th, and met with the same treatment at the Pontypridd Court on June 21st, making four appearances at the Courts without result, he proposes to take any action to protect the rights of the citizen under the conscientious objection section of the Vaccination Act.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: The Justices at Porth twice considered applications from Mr. Griffiths, but were not satisfied that the applicant conscientiously believed that vaccination would be prejudicial to the health of his child. At Ystrad and Pontypridd the Court refused to review the decision of other magistrates. I have no authority to take any action in the matter.

Mr. BRACE: What steps can Mr. Griffiths take to get his case before the Courts? He has a real grievance, for he is a conscientious objector.

*Mr. GLADSTONE replied that the present state of the law gave rise to some friction, and he could only suggest that the hon. Member should induce the Government and Parliament to alter it.

Committal for Contempt of Court—Case of Mrs. Hunt of Exmouth.

Sir G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has made inquiries with reference to the case of Mrs. Hunt, of Exmouth, who has been committed to Exeter Gaol for contempt of Court in not removing a stall which she has held for thirty years on Exmouth beach; and, if so, what is the result of his inquiries.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I understand that Mrs. Hunt has been committed to prison for refusal to comply with an order of the County Court. In these circumstances I regret to say that I can take no action in the matter, as I have no power to interfere with the procedure of a civil Court. Mrs. Hunt can always apply to the Judge and will no doubt obtain her release if she undertakes to obey the order.

Prosecution of a Cab Driver at Marlborough Street Police Court.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the prosecution of a cab driver named Simmons at the Marlborough Street police court on June 29th, when the magistrate, imposing a fine of 40s. with £5 5s. costs, informed counsel for the defence that he declined to reduce the amount on the ground that it was not the accused person but the trade union to which he belonged that was to pay; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

*MR. GLADSTONE: My attention has not previously been called to the case. I have consulted the learned magistrate who tried the case, and he informs me that in fixing the costs he paid no regard to the question who would be responsible for their payment; but when the defending barrister protested against the costs on the ground that they were excessive for a poor man he replied that as the barrister was instructed by the Cab Drivers' Union it was probable that the expense would not fall on the defendant. The question of the amount of costs to be imposed in any given case is by law left to the discretion of the magistrate.

German Railway Statistics.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield Central): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is in a position to state what is the amount of national capital embarked in State railways in Germany, and what interest the net receipts return thereon; and further, what allowance is made from gross earnings for depreciation and sinking fund, as also how many miles of track are worked by the State, and how many passengers were carried last year, and what was the total tonnage of goods hauled.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): According to the latest returns available (March, 1905) the amount of National capital embarked in State railways in Germany (including narrow gauge lines) was £686,300,000 and the percentage of net working receipts to capital was 5·9 per cent. The ength of such railways was 31,600 miles, equivalent to a track mileage of about 69,900 miles. The number of passengers carried in the year 1904–5 was 984,785,000, and the tonnage of goods (inclusive of the weight of live stock) 382,203,000 tons. The net receipts of German State railways are paid into the Treasury and the published returns do not indicate any allowance for depreciation or sinking fund.

British Railway Statistics.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what is the total private capital embarked in British railways; what interest the net receipts return thereon; and what allowance is made for depreciation and sinking fund; and also how many passengers were carried last year, and what was the total tonnage of goods hauled.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The railway companies are not required to state in their returns to the Board of Trade the amounts carried to depreciation and sinking fund accounts. As regards the other points mentioned, the total paid-up capital of British railways at the end of 1905 was £1,088,421,000; the proportion borne by the net receipts to the paid-up capital was approximately 4 per cent.; the number of passengers carried last year, exclusive of season ticket holders, was 1,197,502,000; and the total tonnage of goods hauled was 461,162,000 tons. The hon. and gallant Member will find this information, with other particulars, in the Return Cd. 2948, a copy of which I have caused to be sent to him.

Workmen's Trains.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what steps he proposes to take to carry out the Reports of the Select Committee on Workmen's trains.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: It would not be practicable to legislate on this subject during the present session; but the whole question is engaging my earnest attention. I have been in communication with the railway companies on the subject of recent complaints made. I propose to inform the House of the result when the Board of Trade estimates are reached.

Armagh Boiler Explosion.

Mr. HUDSON (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if any inquiry has been held into the cause of the explosion of the Great Northern Railway Company's (Ireland) locomotive engine boiler at Armagh, on May 16th last, when the engine-driver and fireman were severely scalded; and whether he can say what was the cause of the firebox end of the boiler exploding.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The accident in question was reported to the Board of Trade. No formal inquiry has been held into it, but the Board have received from the railway company full particulars of the nature and causes of the accident. These particulars I shall be prepared to show to the hon. Member.

Metropolitan Asylums Board Hospital Regulations.

Sir J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that, although the rules of the Metropolitan Asylums Board strongly discountenance the making of personal inquiries at infectious hospitals by the friends of patients and state that all inquiries must be made in writing to the medical superintendent, delay frequently occurs in answering such inquiries, and information is not given either to the nearest relative or to the certifying medical attendant as to the diagnosis of the case after admission; whether he is aware of instances in which, from misunderstanding or ignorance of the rules, or other causes, relatives of patients receive no official information whatever during the whole period of detention of the patient; and whether, as the removal of patients is practically compulsory, he will cause a circular to be issued to the Metropolitan Asylums Board, and other similar authorities outside the London area, prescribing forms for brief reports to be sent to relatives at prescribed and frequent intervals, whether formally applied for or not, and for a report on the diagnosis and bacteriological examination of the case to be sent to the medical practitioner by whom the case was certified.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. John Burns, Battersea): The managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District have, as I am informed, no reason to believe that delay frequently occurs in answering letters of inquiry concerning patients in their hospitals, nor have I received complaints on the subject. I understand that the certifying medical practitioner is always informed by the medical superintendent of the hospital when the latter does not agree with the certified diagnosis of the case. Notice of the arrival of a patient at a hospital of the managers is always sent to the parents or other nearest known relative or friend. Extracts from the Regulations are printed on the notice, and these show that inquiries as to the condition of the patient may be made in writing of the Medical Superintendant, who will send an early reply, and that, should the patient become dangerously ill, notice will be sent to the nearest known relative or friend with an intimation that the patient may be visited. I believe, too, that as regards the hospitals of local authorities outside London, it is the general rule to give notice where the patient is dangerously ill. As at present advised, I do not think there is sufficient ground for adopting the suggestion in the last part of the Question, which would involve considerable expense as well as labour to those concerned, I think that the object which my hon. friend has in view will be sufficiently met by the public attention which will be drawn to the matter by his Question.

Notification of Infectious Outbreaks.

Mr. STRAUS: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he intends to suggest to the local authority concerned the desirability of taking legal action against the

Metropolitan Asylums Board for omitting for fourteen days to notify the outbreak of enteric fever, in fact, until there had been more than fifty cases; and whether he can say why the Metropolitan Asylums Board did not use the ordinary test for enteric fever which would have taken but a few hours.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I am informed that the facts are not quite what my hon. friend supposes. I understand that the first notification of the cases of enteric fever at the Belmont Asylum was made twelve days after the earliest manifestation of illness amongst the inmates, and that the number of persons who had been then attacked was ten. At first the patients were supposed to be suffering from influenza. When, however, suspicion arose that the disease was enteric fever the necessary apparatus for applying the test referred to in the Question was obtained, and samples were sent to the bacteriological laboratory of the Asylums Board. On the same day that the real nature of the disease was ascertained as a result of the bacteriological test notification was made. I do not propose to suggest to the local authority to take proceedings against the Asylums Board in the matter.

Mr. STRAUS: Is not twelve days a very long period to elapse before notifying a serious outbreak of this kind?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: Yes, but I am informed that the Board will make the necessary arrangements to prevent the possibility of a recurrence of such delay.

Dr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that the Board had not the necessary apparatus for applying the tests, but had to obtain it?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I do not think the Answer means that, for I believe they had the apparatus. Indeed, I am certain they had, but if the hon. Member will put down his Question I will inquire further.

Motor Car Fatalities.

Mr. G. H. FABER (Boston): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been called to the death, from motor car accidents, of John Waterhouse, killed at Bamber Bridge June 29th; of a child, six years old, killed at Plymouth June 30th; of a girl killed at Battersea July 1st; and of a boy killed in Cambridgeshire July 3rd; and whether he proposes to take any steps to secure to local authorities fuller powers to control motor traffic within their respective areas.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: My attention has not been called to the particular cases mentioned. The question as to what amendments, if any, should be made in the Motor Acts and the Regulations under them is included in the reference to the Royal Commission, and I believe that their Report will be made very shortly.

Mr. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Is it intended to refuse the local authorities control over this traffic?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: No, but I think it would be unwise and injudicious for us to make any alteration until the Commission has reported—which I hope it will do in a few days.

Mr. CATHCART WASON: Are we to draw the inference that you will not sanction new regulations?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I do not think any such inference can be drawn from my Answer. All I suggest is that we should reserve these and other points until the Commission has reported.

Vaccination Fees.

Mr. HUDSON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been called to the existing scale of fees for primary vaccination by the several boards of guardians; and whether, in view of the financial burden imposed on them, he can take immediate steps to alter the scale of fees and cost of administration of the Vaccination Laws.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: Yes, Sir, my attention has been called to this subject, and it is receiving my consideration at the present time

Instruction in Agriculture.

COLONEL HARRISON-BROADLEY (Yorkshire, E.R., Howdenshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, with a view towards checking the migration from the land of its able-bodied population, he will consider the advisability of granting powers to the county education authority to liberate from school attendance, at the age of twelve, all boys who, with their parents' consent, wish to follow the pursuit of agriculture or horticulture as a means of livelihood, whereby they would gain on the land greater facilities for acquiring a more practical knowledge of their work than they could otherwise do by attending school where the instruction given can only be of a theoretical nature.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The local education authorities in rural districts already possess, and the great majority of them already use, very considerable powers of the kind desired by the hon. Member. I am informed that in about two-thirds of the rural areas of England and Wales children can leave school at twelve years of age on passing a standard well within the competence of the average child of that age. There are also special provisions, such as that which is known as the Robson By-law, which can be adopted with the same objects in rural areas. Moreover, the Board of Education are giving special attention to the improvement of practical instruction in rural schools, and to the improvement of special courses for teachers in rural elementary schools enabling them to give instruction specially suited to rural conditions. I do not think, therefore, that, until there has been time to gauge the effects of these recent developments, the Board or Parliament would be well advised to interfere further, in the direction suggested, with the work of our schools in rural areas.

Medical Inspection of School Children.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether Clause 35, sub-section (*b*), of the Education Bill empowers a local authority to arrange for the systematic inspection of children by medical officers appointed for that purpose; and, if so, whether, with the view of affording some guidance or assistance to the authorities adopting this clause, he contemplates the formation of a medical department in connection with the Education Board.

MR. BIRRELL: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, I have nothing to add to the reply which I gave on June 14th to an identical Question put to me by the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil.†

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): Is it the intention of the Government to make it compulsory on the local authorities to appoint medical officers to inspect the children?

MR. BIRRELL: No, Sir.

MR. THORNE: Why not?

Teachers' Superannuation.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in the event of a school becoming a State-aided and non-rate-aided school, contemplated under the amended form of Clause 4, the certificated teacher or teachers working in such school will be permitted to remain in recorded service under The Teachers' Superannuation Act, 1898.

MR. BIRRELL: The Answer is in the affirmative.

Llanelian School Teacher.

MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Denbighshire local education authority have declined to pay to the head teacher of Llanelian National School a salary which is, in the opinion of the Board of Education, adequate; and, if so, what steps the Board proposes to take in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The Answer to the first paragraph of the Question is in the affirmative; and to the second, that the matter has only just been brought to my notice, and I am now communicating with the local education authority upon the matter with a view to obtaining a satisfactory settlement.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 1144.

State-Aided School Grants.

MR. J. F. MASON (Windsor): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education who will receive and administer grants payable to State-aided schools.

MR. BIRRELL: The persons recognised by the Board of Education as the responsible body of managers of the school will receive and administer the grants payable in respect of any State-aided school.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Who are these persons to be?

MR. BIRRELL: I cannot answer that. They will have to be responsible persons.

Teachers and Religious Instruction.

MR. J. F. MASON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether a teacher who has been permitted to give and has undertaken to give special religious instruction under Clause 4 of the Education Bill may be dismissed if he afterwards refuses to give that instruction?

MR. BIRRELL: The various conditions under which a teacher's tenure of office might probably be brought to an end by a local authority which has appointed him would depend, presumably, upon the terms of his agreement or contract. It is therefore, quite impossible to give a general reply applicable to all such incidents in the future. But the correct reply to the point, which I imagine to be the real kernel of the hon. Member's Question, would seem to be that careful regard must be had to the provisions of Section 7 of the Bill in the drawing up and signing of any such agreement or contract whether by the applicant or by the appointing authority, so that there may be no infringement of the clause either in the terms of that document or in its enforcement should any such contingency arise as that suggested by the hon. Member.

Part III. of the Education Bill.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if it is proposed to omit any clauses in Part III. of the Education Bill?

MR. BIRRELL: The hon. Member will find on the Order Paper to-day Amendments in my name proposing the omission of Clauses 25, 30, and 34 of the Bill.

"Extended Facilities" Administration.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he will explain the procedure to be followed by a local education authority where extended facilities are demanded, explaining in particular the number of public inquiries which should be held in order to ascertain whether a ballot is necessary; whether the results of the ballot have been vitiated by the unavoidable absence of some person entitled to vote; and whether further public school accommodation is desired by those who have asked for extended facilities.

MR. BIRRELL: I must refer the hon. Member to my reply to the hon. Member for Melton on July 2nd, to which I have nothing to add.†

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether a vacancy in the teaching staff occurring in a school to which extended facilities have been granted, it will be permissible for the local education authority to take steps to ascertain that the teacher engaged to fill the vacancy is able or willing to give the special religious instruction allowed in that school.

MR. BIRRELL: If the word "whether" be substituted for the word "that," in the Question, after the word "ascertain," the Answer is in the affirmative, assuming State-aided schools to be excluded from consideration. But, if the word "that" be retained, and if I rightly interpret the purport of the hon. Member's Question in that shape, the Answer is in the negative.

Teachers' Undertakings.

MR. LANE-FOX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education how it is proposed to enforce the undertaking or contract of a teacher, express or implied, to give religious instruction, having regard to the words of Section 7 (1) of the Education Bill.

---

† See reply to Colonel Walker, Lancashire, Widnes ((4) *Debates*, clix., 1427).

MR. BIRRELL: It is no part of the duties of the Board of Education to arrange or to enforce contracts between teachers and the local authorities who appoint them, nor to give legal advice to either parties beforehand on the remedies open to them for breaches of contract. Presumably any contracts that are drawn in accordance with the law will be subject to the usual legal sanctions, and it will be for both parties to take care that no contracts are entered into which would be contrary to any provisions of the law in regard to what may and what may not in future properly be required as obligatory duties of candidates for teaching posts.

MR. LANE-FOX: Are not existing contracts to be continued after the new Act comes into force?

MR. BIRRELL: I must ask for notice of that Question.

MR. LANE-FOX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the agreement or minute of appointment under which teachers are now employed by local education authorities embodies or includes an undertaking to give religious instruction.

MR. BIRRELL: In the great majority of cases I believe such an undertaking, either express or implied, is included; but this is not necessarily the case, and no doubt there are many instances to the contrary.

Report of the Royal Commission on London Traffic.

MR. MENZIES (Lanarkshire, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what was the cost to the country of printing, publishing, and circulating Volume 4, Appendices to the Report of the Royal Commission on London Traffic; and whether he will consider the possibility, in the interests of economy, of adopting some other method of publishing and making known this matter to persons interested.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The cost of printing, including paper, of the volume in question was £1,552. There are no special charges for publishing and circulation, as this work is let out to sale agents. I will reply to the last part of my hon. friend's Question in my Answer to his next Question.

MR. MENZIES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what was the total cost of the whole eight volumes of the London Traffic Commission Report and Appendices; how many copies were printed; how many were sold and what amount was received for them; how many were distributed officially; how many are left on hand; and what steps, if any, he proposes to take to prevent a repetition of such expenditure.

MR. McKENNA: The cost for printing and paper of the whole eight volumes was £6,380. In addition, I am informed, the Ordnance Survey incurred expenditure in preparing and printing maps amounting to £1,400 to March 31st last. The number of copies of all the volumes printed is 14,000. Of these 4,022 have been sold up to date, and the net amount received for them, after deducting the sale agents' percentages, is £2,637. I think it would be premature for me to make any statement in reply to the last part of my hon. friend's Question until the Report has been issued of the Select Committee which is now considering the subject.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) asked if the hon. Gentleman could state how many hon. Members cared to have their bookshelves littered with this rubbish.

MR. McKENNA: I have no information at this moment, but if the hon. Member desires I will have steps taken to find out.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: It is £8,000 wasted on rubbish.

Fatal Accidents (Scotland) Bill.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the hon. Member for North Norfolk, as Chairman of the Committee of Selection, whether it is proposed to transfer the fifteen Members already added to the Grand Committee on Law, in respect of the Fatal Accidents (Scotland) Bill, to the Grand Committee on Trade to which that Bill has now been transferred by Resolution of the House.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): Yes, Sir, and the notices have been or will immediately be sent out.

Ceylon Pearl Fisheries.

MR. J. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the facts that the ex-Governor of Ceylon commenced the negotiations for a lease of the Ceylon pearl fisheries, that a lease was granted to a syndicate, of which the ex-Governor was a member, and by the syndicate sold to a company of which the ex-Governor is a shareholder and director, he will grant a full inquiry by Commission or otherwise into the whole circumstances, correspondence, and documents leading up to these transactions, by which the Ceylon Government have transferred to a private company a valuable property of the Colony for inadequate consideration.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): In his dispatch of 9th May, which has been laid before the House, the Secretary of State, who is cognisant of the circumstances connected with the leasing of the fishery, has recorded the opinion that the lease appears to him to have been drafted with a sincere desire to safeguard to the utmost the property and interests of the Colony. It has also been stated in the House that a careful study of the Papers shows that Sir West Ridgeway acted throughout in good faith and with integrity. I therefore see no grounds for granting a special inquiry.

Scottish Supply.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that the Foreign Office Vote occupied all the sitting last Thursday, he will find another day for Scotch Estimates.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I will see if it is in any way possible to give more time. But I am bound to say that I cannot hold out any very strong hopes of being able to do so.

Wireless Telegraphy Bill.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister upon which day he proposes to take into consideration the Lords' Amendments to the Wireless Telegraphy Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot tell the hon. Member on what day these Amendments will be considered. I believe the hon. Member is not quite correct in speaking of "these Amendments." There is only one Amendment, to substitute "9" for "15," or *vice versa* as the case may be—I forget for the moment.

Army Supply.

SIR CARNE RASCH: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, considering the protracted character of speeches and the importance of the subject, he would allocate an additional day for the debate on the proposal of the Secretary of State for War.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Army Supply has already been discussed on five days this session, and I am afraid it is impossible to give a further day in addition to Thursday next.

Ulster Sermon at Belfast.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to a meeting in Ulster Hall, Belfast, on July 1st, and to a sermon delivered by the Reverend R. D. Patterson, who warned His Majesty that by his conduct to the Roman Catholic party since he came to the throne he had excited suspicion, alienated the affections, and strained the loyalty of thousands of his most valuable subjects, and that he must cease at once coquetting with the Church of Rome or else his throne would rock; and whether he proposes to take any action with regard to this sermon.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): My attention has been called to a newspaper report of the sermon to which the hon. Member refers. If the reverend gentleman is correctly reported he appears to have made use of language of a most violent and disloyal character. I appreciate the horror and indignation with which my hon. friend naturally regards such language; and I sympathise with his evident desire that criminal proceedings should be taken against the reverend gentleman who uttered it.

Having regard, however, to the fact that there is no serious risk, so far as I can judge, of any actual breach of the peace being provoked by the reverend gentleman's language, the Government does not propose to take any action in the matter.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Was this a meeting of 100 lodges of the Orange Society, and may this be taken as a sample of the loyalty of the so-called loyal minority?

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): Has the Attorney-General any authorised report of this sermon, or is his inference drawn from the Question due to the imagination of the hon. Member for East Clare?

MR. CHERRY: I have seen no authorised report, inasmuch as no police were present at the meeting. I have only seen the newspaper report, and cannot say whether it is accurate or not.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked was the right hon. Member aware that these blood-curdling proceedings ended with the singing of "God Save the King?"

LORD TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): In what paper did the report appear?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Was it not printed in several of the Dublin newspapers? Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to ascertain whether it was a correct report, and will he bear in mind I was often put in gaol for nothing at all?

MR. CHERRY: I read the report in the *Belfast News Letter*. I was not aware it had travelled so far as Dublin.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Will the right hon. Gentleman take care to send a police note-taker to future meetings of this kind?

[No Answer was returned.]

Kinvara Harbour.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the legal technicality between the Board of Agriculture and the Galway County Council, respecting certain works to be carried out in Kinvara Harbour, has been got over; and will he instruct the Department of Agriculture and the Congested Districts Board to write to the Galway County Council approving of the plans for the extension of the pier, submitted by the county surveyor, so that the contract may be given out at the next meeting of the county council, to be held on July 20th, with a view to starting the work early in August.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): As I explained in my reply to the hon. Member's Question of June 21st, the legal difficulty is not one which concerns the contribution of the Department of Agriculture, but relates to the powers of the county council to contribute. The Government are advised that under the existing law the county council are not empowered to contribute so large an amount as is proposed in the present case. The question whether legislation may be necessary is under consideration.

MR. DUFFY: Will the right hon. Gentleman instruct the Board of Works to utilise the unexpended moneys to enable the county council to do the necessary repairs?

MR. BRYCE: It seems that the county council have no power to expend the money, and I have no control over the Board of Works. This matter is under the control of the Treasury, whose sanction must be obtained for the expenditure.

MR. SLOAN: What Board of Ireland has the right hon. Gentleman any control over?

MR. BRYCE: That would fill a long list.

MR. DUFFY: But was not a sum of £1,900 placed at the disposal of the Boards of Works to carry out certain repairs to this harbour; have they not still £550 in hand, and will the right hon. Gentleman instruct the Board to hand over the money to the county council?

MR. BRYCE: I cannot answer as to the exact figures without notice, and I have told the hon. Member what my relations to the Board of Works are.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman give this matter his close attention? It is really very hard on the people of this locality that the work of their little harbour should remain uncompleted because of the inaction of the Treasury.

Mr. BRYCE: Unfortunately the law will not permit the county council to do what it is willing to do.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will you at once introduce legislation, giving the county council the necessary powers?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Notice must be given of that Question.

Glenaboy Evicted Tenants.

Mr. DUFFY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received a copy of a resolution passed by the people of the parish of Closetoken, Loughrea, requesting the Commissioners to communicate with the landlord of a small property in the parish, to wit, Colonel O'Hara, Glenaboy, Galway City, with a view of endeavouring to restore Mrs. Duffy or her next-of-kin to the holding out of which she was evicted some twelve years ago; and whether, seeing that the terms of agreement have been signed by the agricultural tenants to purchase their holdings, he will ask the Commissioners to accede at once to the prayer of the resolution and try and have this lady reinstated.

Mr. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received the resolution referred to. Mrs. Duffy's case has been noted and will be fully considered by the Commissioners when the owner of the estate institutes, as they understand he is about to do, proceedings for sale under the Irish Land Act, 1903.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Belfast whether he means to proceed with his Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, as amended by the Standing Committee on Trade?

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): The hon. Member is, no doubt, aware that the Bill was amended in Grand Committee on the lines of the compromise negotiated by the hon. Member for South Tyrone. I had no knowledge of the negotiations that took place, nor was I consulted. I was no party to the compromise, and when the Bill was before the Committee I stated clearly that I could not be bound in any way in regard to future legislation, but, at the same time, the arrangements come to were such that I could not take the responsibility of rejecting them and imperilling the Bill.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is it not the fact that the Grand Committee were perfectly unanimous in this matter, and that not a single division was taken?

Mr. SLOAN: Yes, and it is that circumstance which caused me to refuse to take the responsibility of withdrawing the Bill; at the same time I strongly protested against the alterations.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: You did not vote against them.

Mr. SLOAN: There was no voting at all.

Ireland and the Royal Commission on Canals.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether arrangements have been made to add a member to the Royal Commission on Canals in respect to the Irish portion of the subject which is being inquired into; and when will this appointment be made and the name of the new Commissioner announced?

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. I am in communication with the Chairman of the Royal Commission on this subject, and hope to be able to give a definite reply before the House rises.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this Session of Parliament relating to the Revenues of India be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the Whole House.—(*Mr. Secretary Morley.*)

Resolved, That this House will, upon Friday, 20th July, resolve itself into the said Committee.—(*Mr. Secretary Morley.*)

RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Lords' Amendments to be considered forthwith; considered, and agreed to.—(*Mr. Secretary Haldane.*)

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure, in respect of the Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill: Dr. Macnamara; and had appointed in substitution, Major Renton.

Report to lie upon the Table.

BUTTER TRADE.

Report from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, brought up, and read;

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 245.]

NEW BILL.

IRISH TOBACCO BILL.

"To repeal the Law which prohibits the growing of Tobacco in Ireland," presented by Mr. William Redmond; supported by Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, and Mr. Charles Devlin; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 303.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the chair.]

Clause 8:—

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) moved to leave out the words in sub-section (*a*) "sufficient guarantee is given," and insert "they are satisfied that sufficient provision will be made." The hon. Member contended that the words of the section were too strong. A guarantee for five years was a very serious thing and might mean an expenditure of £500 or £1,000 during that period, which would be a severe strain; only the other Wednesday the Minister for Education said that he did not intend to require "guarantee" in the legal sense of the term, but only that the Commissioners should have a reasonable assurance that the school would be carried on.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 19, to leave out the words 'sufficient guarantee is given,' and insert the words 'they are satisfied that sufficient provision will be made.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'sufficient' stand part of the Clause."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said he thought the word "guarantee" was sufficient. What they wanted to do was simply to bring before the minds of the Commissioners that they must have some good grounds to go upon that the school was going to be carried on for five years. It was not a long period, and what Parliament had done was to give an indication of their opinion. A general assurance was not sufficient; what the Commissioners had to consider was whether the proposals put before them amounted to a reasonable guarantee. He did not consider that the words proposed by the hon. Member would make things any better. The word "guarantee" brought to the minds of the Commissioners the very point the Government wished. They would not put any strict legal definition upon the word, but they would take care that a positive assurance would be given that the school should be carried on; he thought the words as they stood were good words and should be retained.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University) pointed out that the sub-section enacted that a guarantee should be given. He wished to know by whom the guarantee would be given and in whose interests? He suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should select some words which would reasonably satisfy the Commissioners and at the same time be more specific.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) thought that the Minister for Education would be well advised in substituting the words "reasonable assurance," because the word "guarantee" was open to much misconstruction and misinterpretation by the Commissioners.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) did not think they should insist upon so strong a word as "guarantee."

Mr. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said that the word "guarantee" meant some promise which contained a legal obligation.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said that the Minister for Education had stated over and over again that the new court would fulfil the same functions as the Charity Commissioners and the Chancery Court, and would give their decisions upon the same principles. He had never heard that it was the principle of the Court of Chancery or of the Charity Commissioners to require guarantees for the fulfilment of the trusts so long as trusts were being fulfilled. It seemed to him that the whole sub-section really violated the principles laid down by the Minister for Education in his speeches. He urged the Minister in charge of the Bill to do everything he could to mitigate the severity of the section, and suggested that he would be well advised to accept some words less rigid than the words which stood upon the Paper. The more the Bill was mitigated the more it would conform to the intentions expressed by the Minister for Education.

Mr. BIRRELL said that the object of the words was to afford the Commissioners reasons for determining what should comprise a sufficient guarantee. In his opinion the word "guarantee" was a very good one and quite adequate. Anyone who read this clause would see that the Commissioners had imposed upon them the legal obligation of making schemes, and if a trust was in anything like default and the trustees came to the Court of Chancery nothing would be easier than to require some assurance or guarantee that they were in a position to keep their word. The duties of the Commissioners ought not to be confounded in this way, and the people who said they were able to keep a school going for five years should be in a position to satisfy the Commissioners that they were able to do so.

Amendment negatived.

*Sir HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said a principle of great importance was involved in the Amendment which he proposed. It had been said of the right hon. Gentleman that the sub-sections were only illustrative or superfluous. But sub-section (a) was something more than this. The Minister for Education said the course followed by the Commissioners would be precisely that of any Court of Justice, but was it possible that such a Court could hold that a proposal to carry on a trust in exactly the same way as it had been carried on before, with instruction precisely the same as from the beginning, was not carrying out the spirit of the trust? Was it a proper mode of giving effect to it when the only alternative means by which it could be effected was by requiring that the school should pass under an authority which was not in existence or even contemplated when the trust was founded It seemed to him that a sub-section like that was neither illustrative nor descriptive, and that it introduced into the action of the Commissioners a consideration of an entirely new kind which was subversive altogether of trusts, and one which no Court would ever be likely to follow in deciding what was or was not a proper means of giving effect to the trust. What did this guarantee which was to be demanded amount to? The President of the Board of Education said it was not to be too exactly defined and that it was not necessary for any rich men to give the guarantee, and that poor men would do quite as well. How was a guarantee which implied the supporting of a school at great expense for five years to be given without being backed by some man of means? What means had the parents for giving such a guarantee? If a school, say, of 100 scholars was to be carried on without rate aid or grant, the expenditure could not be less than £400 a year, and to guarantee that amount for five years was exacting something that had never before been exacted from any school in the past, and no school in the future could undertake to fulfil it. The homes of the children might be moved, there might be a great change in the population, the school might become useless, and then the guarantee would not only become useless, but impossible to fulfil. It really meant that they were imposing a condition which had never before been imposed upon a public elementary school in the country, and it was a condition which most school managers would declare was impossible of fulfilment. Was it the right hon. Gentleman's intention to stamp out of existence the voluntary schools, even in cases where they were asking for no help from the Parliamentary grant and no assistance from the rates? The President of the Board of Trade had told them "clericalism was the enemy," and they knew the source from which he got that phrase. Had the Minister for Education derived his inspiration from the same source? He thought the words he suggested were a better and a sounder alternative than the guarantee proposed, and he hoped they would be accepted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 19, to leave out from the word 'sufficient,' to the word 'and,' in line 21, and insert the words 'evidence is furnished that such a proposal is in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the parents of children attending the school.'"—(*Sir Herbert Craik.*)

Question proposed, "That the words to the word 'for' in page 5, line 21 stand part of the clause."

Mr. BIRRELL reminded the Committee that Clause 1 placed certain obligations upon voluntary schools, and it was impossible to go back upon or disregard the principle laid down in that clause. The point they were now considering was that where a school could satisfy the Commissioners that it could keep its doors open for five years, it should be allowed to come under this sub-section. They were now considering the financial, not the educational position. The whole motive of this proposal was to substitute the wishes of the parents, and it was really irrelevant to sub-section (*a*). If the parents were in a position to promise financial support that might be sufficient, but the mere fact that the parents wished the schools to continue was not relevant to the matter with which they were now dealing. Therefore he could not accept the Amendment, which was inconsistent with the whole scope of Clause 1. A school had got to fulfil its trust as best it could, and the trustees might be bound by the decision of the Commissioners to transfer their school to the local authority as the only means of carrying out the trust. If the trustees were in a position to give a guarantee for the effective continuance of the school they would get the benefit of the clause. That was a financial consideration, and had nothing whatever to do with the wishes of the parents.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said the Amendment was intended to meet the case of schools which otherwise did not fall under this Bill at all. That being so, they were surely entitled to look to the circumstances and conditions of the case, and to ascertain not merely whether the financial position of the trustees was adequate, but also whether there was a general desire that the school should go on under the exceptional conditions created by the Bill. He thought this clause was not merely financial, but that it related to schools outside the purview of the rest of the Bill.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said the Commissioners were to be empowered to make a scheme with respect to the best mode in which effect could be given to the trusts of the schoolhouse in future, but they were not to be allowed to do so unless certain conditions were satisfied. That was to say, the Commissioners were not to give the best effect that could be given to the trusts unless "sufficient guarantee is given for the effective continuance of the school for a period of at least five years." That was a perfectly unreasonable doctrine. He could understand the Government saying that they were not to be allowed to carry on a school as a certified efficient school, even if it was the best way of carrying out the trusts, unless the parents wished it. That was the Amendment of his hon. friend. He did not understand why any question of five years should arise. It appeared to him that the continuance of the school was a matter which might well be left entirely to the trustees. The question whether the parents desired the school was one which the Commissioners might not—he did not know that they would be entitled to—consider in determining the best way of carrying out the purposes of the trusts.

SIR E. CARSON asked whether the Committee were to understand that if the trustees of a school desired to carry it on without any aid from the State, and if the parents of a majority of the children attending the school also desired to carry it on without any aid from the State, it would not be possible to do so after this Bill passed.

MR. BIRRELL said the duty of the Commissioners was to see that effect was given to the trusts, and in order to see that a school could be effectively carried on surely it was necessary to see that it would be effectively carried on for some time. If the trustees could snap their fingers and say, "We can get on without you, as our forefathers did," that was giving effect to the trust, and he did not think they should find fault. But it should be remembered that the local education authority had to consider the educational needs of the whole area, and that it had to satisfy itself that there was proper school accommodation for the whole of the children in the area. It was entitled to know what schools it could look to for performing this function. He did not think there was anything unreasonable in asking a sufficient guarantee for the effective continuance of the school for a period of five years.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 236; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 193.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Parker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'Harmlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon John Edward
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Illingworth, Percy H.

Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas.N.(Doncaster
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson,SirG. Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R.(Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, SirJohn L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton,Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon.C.H.W.(Hull,W.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Woodhouse,SirJT(Hudd'rsfi'ld
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E).
Acland-Hood,RtHn. SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arnold-Forster,RtHn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach, Hn.MichaelHugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(AntrimS.
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Ginnell, L.
Gordon,SirW.Evans-(T'rHam)
Halpin, J.
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn.Col.W.
Kilbride, Denis
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred

MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Middlemore, JohnThrogmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor,James(Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, SirGilbert(Gravesend)
Pease, HerbertPike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G(Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Henry Craik and Lord Robert Cecil.

MR. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.) said that the intention of this Bill seemed to be to destroy the Church schools, although not the Jewish, Roman Catholic, and very few of the Wesleyan schools. Clause 8 was aimed specially at Church schools, and it was because of the animus of hon. Gentlemen opposite they were to be destroyed. A five years guarantee was impossible. The amount of money to be given was too much. He had been told by an hon. Gentleman who sat below him and who was an expert, that it would mean £400,000 a year. Elderly men, who might be asked to give a guarantee, would die in the meantime, and the whole guarantee would be unsatisfied, and young men who had given a guarantee might emigrate. Five years was too large a part of a man's life for him to feel confidence in giving a guarantee to maintain the present management of a Church school for that period. Therefore he moved to substitute "one" for "five."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 21, to leave out the words 'five years' and insert the words 'one year.'"—(*Mr. Middlemore.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'five years' stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said he was unable to agree with his hon. friend that a period of five years was too long as showing the amount of support which might be given by the neighbourhood to a particular school, nor could he believe that it was an impossible guarantee. It had not been suggested that the guarantee should be in the form of a sum named or anything of that kind. It was simply left to the Commission to satisfy themselves that there was a sufficient guarantee that the parents in the neighbourhood would continue to support the school in an efficient state. The guarantee of five years, he thought, did not go really beyond the necessities of the case. In fact, the Government had considered this point very carefully and some people thought that five years was too short a period. They must remember that the local authority had to consider the responsibility which was placed upon them and that they must know whether the school was likely to be continued to be supported.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that this was only another instance of the way in which the Bill would affect injuriously the rural districts. In these districts it might be quite impossible to get more than one or two gentlemen to support a school continuously or for more than one year. He thought the right hon. Gentleman forgot that it was not a mere general assurance or general statement to the Commission which was required, but that a guarantee was to be given.

MR. BIRRELL: A sufficient guarantee.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON: A sufficient guarantee for the effective continuance of the school for five years. Everybody knew that a guarantee was a technical term. He knew that it was sometimes used in a colloquial sense;

but if the Commission acted with the powers of the Court of Chancery they would not use legal phraseology in that sense. The only persons who could give a guarantee would be very few, and he thought these persons would rather shrink from the term "guarantee." Nothing could happen under this clause unless demanded by the local education authority. Under these circumstances it would be exceedingly hard to insist upon this continuous assurance for five years, when they might get persons or bodies to give the guarantee from year to year. He admitted that the term of five years might not be excessive in urban districts where there were persons of wealth in considerable numbers who contributed to denominational schools, but he ventured to think that it was likely to impose very great hardship on the rural districts where there might be only one school to which the neighbourhood was attached and which might be continued if a large landowner in the neighbourhood were permitted to give an assurance for a year at a time, when he would not be likely to give it under the severe terminology of the clause.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said he would like the right hon. Gentleman to reconsider this question. If he could not agree to one year he might agree to three years, which he himself had ventured to suggest in an Amendment standing in his name. For himself he thought that if the Commission found that the school had been carried on efficiently, a guarantee for one year was quite as good as a guarantee for five years if there was evidence that there were really people of ability behind it. There were difficulties about a formal guarantee, and the piling up of conditions made it a formidable undertaking. In many rural districts where the owner of a property had only a title for life, he might be perfectly willing to give a guarantee for one year, but would hesitate to give a guarantee for five years. After all, these schools would have to be brought before the Commission by the local education authority, and he thought it would be rather unreasonable that the whole strength of the local education authority should be brought into force to make an additional barrier in the way of carrying on these schools. He pleaded with the right hon. Gentleman to accept the modified term of three years.

Sir E. CARSON could not see why the Minister for Education should say that five years was of great importance. Supposing the guarantee failed after one year, what would happen? Would anybody be sued? He could not see what the value of the five years guarantee would be, because, as he understood the Bill, if a school was not continued as efficient, the work of that school would not be a sufficient compliance with the Education Act, so that it would be no longer of any use as a public elementary school. It should be sufficient to have a guarantee renewed from year to year.

Mr. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said he thought it would be a very serious thing for any person to give a guarantee for such a long period as five years. The liability to take on this responsibility for a period of five years might place the trustees in a very unfortunate position.

Mr. BIRRELL quite agreed that the sub-section did not give them very much, but they were trying to get what they could. Supposing a guarantee was given and it appeared that the school could be made an efficient school, and it paid to make it one, then the local education authority was under a responsibility to take it over. Let the Committee consider the difficulty of the local education authority, if the guarantee was not forthcoming. They would be unable to ascertain their liabilities. This sub-section was not a protection of the local education authority at all, because the local education authority might, if the guarantee after two or three years failed, find that the school was of no use, the children could no longer go to it, and they would be burdened with the responsibility of providing a site and buildings for themselves. It seemed to him important that the Commission should be able to protect the local authority against such a contingency. That was the reason why the Government had named a date, which would make the persons who wished to maintain their school as an efficient school see the responsibility they would assume, and make them come forward with such an amount of support as would satisfy the Commissioners that they would be able to keep their school going for five years. He thought the argument was in favour of retaining the words of the sub-section.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman threw a strong light upon the whole object and intention of the sub-section, which seemed to be to impose a fine upon particular trustees so that they should be forced to give up their trusts, in favour of the local authority, in order that the school might be carried on. Such a course would be a very gross injustice, and would be very hard upon voluntary schools. In the parallel case of a hospital supported by voluntary contributions; who could guarantee that those subscriptions would be continued for five years? The provision would impose a severe disability upon trustees which should not be imposed upon them except for an adequate cause. What was the adequate cause put forward in this case? Education would, he thought, suffer unless the proposal of his friend were accepted. Suppose the right hon. Gentleman, instead of insisting upon five years, assented to a proposal of one year, and at the end of two years it was found impossible for the philanthropists or parents in the neighbourhood to provide the accommodation, and they could not carry on the school. The Commission would then say that they must allow the local education authority to take over the school. Why not wait till that contingency happened? The right hon. Gentleman was really, by his own admission, trying to warp and pervert the practice of the Court of Chancery, which appeared so prominently in his speeches, by requiring the Court to impose an obligation which was absolutely of a destructive character. It was a fine so heavy that it could not be paid. It was a condition so onerous that it could not be complied with, and it was imposed because it could not be complied with and in order to drive the trustees into the arms of the local authorities. It was not justified in the interests of the children; it was not justified in the legitimate interests of the local authorities or the ratepayers; and it was profoundly injurious to the trustees.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) wished to know why it was that in this particular kind of school a guarantee was to be exacted which was not exacted in regard to any of the existing certified schools.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 252; Noes, 131. (Division List No. 194.)

AYES.

Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (Tow'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.)

Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, John A.(Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. M. (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George, A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L(Caithn'ss sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor(Mon.,S.
Herbert,T. Arnold(Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E.H.
Hodge, John
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewick, Sir George

Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, HughCecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas.N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Rt.Hn.E.(Dundee)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.

Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton und.Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Phillips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stokeupon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas CourtenayT.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon.C.H.W.(Hull,W.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major

Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,RtHn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn.Sir H.

Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.
Balfour, Capt. C. B.(Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George

Baring, Hon. Guy(Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt.Hn.Sir Edward H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates,E.Feetham(Lewisham)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Lloyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(AntrimS.
Craig, CaptainJames(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Dolan,Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York.)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Gordon,SirW.Evans-(T'rHam.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Hunt, Rowland
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn. Col. W.
Kilbride, Denis
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Lundon, W.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down,S.)
M'Kean, John
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Middlemore, JohnThrogmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
O Malley, William
O Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker,Sir Gilbert(Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. HnJ.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

MR. MIDDLEMORE moved to leave out from "is" to "they," and insert "advisable," in order to protest against the wording of this sub-section, which seemed to him about the most satirical and cynical bit of printing he had ever read. The Government said they proposed to give effect to the trusts, and they proposed to give effect to them by abolishing them; they proposed to give effect to their affections by murdering the object of them. Why could not the Government say what they meant in plain words and save the Committee this almost satanic cynicism. They were not going to give effect to the trusts in any legitimate way; they were going to abolish them, and the best way they could do that was to say so in plain and palpable language. The Government had adopted Dr. Clifford's policy; why did not they adopt his manly and straightforward attitude. Dr. Clifford——

THE CHAIRMAN hoped the hon. Member would make plain the relevancy of his remarks to the Amendment.

MR. MIDDLEMORE said he wished to protest against the cynical language of the clause. It had given him and others considerable pain. He did, however, now make his brief protest and would not make any further demand on the patience of the Committee.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 24, to leave out from the word 'is' to the word 'they,' in line 25, and to insert the word 'advisable.'"—(*Mr. Middlemore.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause" put, and agreed to.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) moved to leave out the word "best," and insert the word "only" in line 25. They were told that the object of this clause was only to deal with charitable trusts. That being so, the word "only" was, in his opinion, better than "best." The words would then read "only mode of giving effect to the trusts." He supposed the right hon. Gentleman would object to this Amendment; and if he did he (Lord Balcarres) hoped he would explain to what the word "best" was meant to apply, and thus aid the Committee to come to a decision.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 25, to leave out the word 'best,' and to insert the word 'only.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said the word best was employed to bring in the doctrine of *cypres*. The Commissioners had to consider this problem. A school was governed by a particular trust to provide for the education of the children of a particular parish for ever. Then came difficulties as to finance. The trustees could not give the assurance required; they had no money; they had in the past carried on their trust with public money. Then came this legislation which put upon the Commissioners the task of determining whether or not the best way of carrying out the trust would not be to transfer the school to the public authority. That might not be the only way, but the best way. The word "best" simply enabled the Commissioners to apply the principle of *cypres* if the best way of giving effect to the trusts was to transfer them.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said they started with the assumption that this was a mixed trust and that there were other things besides giving elementary education which the trustees had to do. Then came a conflict with the local authority which might have arisen in various ways as to the terms of taking over, and the local authority took the school before the Commission. Were the Commissioners to have no guidance whatever in considering these matters? Under the Act of 1902 when the Board of Education had to determine whether a school of this or that character was to be allowed they were told they had to consider the interests of the rate-payers, the area the school was to provide for, and the wishes of the parents. Did the word best include all or any of these things. What was the line they would have to take if they had to make a scheme for the school? It seemed to him that these different issues ought to be taken in the instructions to the Commissioners.

SIR E. CARSON said he did not think on examination the Amendment of the noble Lord was a suitable Amendment at the moment, and he would ask his noble friend not to press it to a division. They had the assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that in the case of a mixed trust the Commissioners would not make a scheme at all.

MR. BIRRELL: The alternative trusts we do not touch.

SIR E. CARSON said it was quite apparent. therefore, that the matter which the noble Lord tried to guard against really did not enter into consideration here at all. There might be the case of a mixed trust where the trustees of the school did not wish to raise the objection that it was a mixed trust, and in that case if it were best to carry the school on as a public elementary school the trustees might even be consenting parties to it; otherwise the trust might be left in a derelict form and of no use at all to the public. That would be somewhat of a misfortune to the public and the object of the trust. For that reason he did not think the noble Lord ought to press the Amendment. At the same time he failed to understand the reason the right hon. Gentleman had given for opposing the Amendment. It was the first time he had ever heard that the Court of Chancery could not carry out the doctrine of *cypres*. He should have thought it was the very element of the case.

MR. BIRRELL: So it is.

SIR E. CARSON: Then why put this in again if they have the power already to carry out the *cypres* doctrine?

MR. BIRRELL said it was in order to enable them to give rent.

SIR E. CARSON quite agreed that that was the object of the clause, but that was not the object of the word "best." If the word was not there at all, the object stated by the right hon. Gentleman would be secured. He could not help thinking the right hon. Gentleman was not candid in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: I may be stupid, but I am quite candid.

SIR E. CARSON: I do not think anyone would accuse the right hon. Gentleman of being stupid.

MR. BIRRELL: I would much sooner be thought stupid than not candid.

SIR E. CARSON said it was quite obvious that the Court of Chancery had the power of carrying out the *cypres* doctrine, and what he really feared was that there was some hidden meaning behind this word "best." It seemed on the right hon. Gentleman's own argument to be absolutely unnecessary.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON moved to leave out the words after "scheme" in line 26 and to insert words requiring the local education authority to comply with such conditions as to payment or otherwise not being inconsistent with the Act. He said he only desired the President of the Board of Education to carry out the undertaking he gave when he introduced the Bill. Under the clause as it stood the trustees of a school might endeavour to make an arrangement with the local authority under Clause 2, but negotiations having failed in attaining this object, the local authority might bring the trustees before the Commission—which he supposed would be ambulatory—and the Commission, having inspected the schools and taken evidence, might come to the conclusion that on the whole the arrangement proposed by the trustees was a suitable and equitable one in accordance with the *cypres* doctrine. A scheme would accordingly be made, and up to that moment there was no reason to suppose it would not be carried into effect. But then the local authority might refuse to agree and the school might be left derelict. What the local education authority agreed to do came first in the clause, and what the Commission thought to be just came second, and that seemed to him to put the Commission in a somewhat inferior position to the High Court, because when the High Court made a scheme he did not suppose it was open to either party to snap their fingers at the Court simply because they did not approve of the entire scheme. He therefore asked the right hon. Gentleman to make the clause what he said the clause would be when he introduced the Bill, giving them clearly to understand that the local authority would be required to adopt the scheme which the Commission thought just, and which embodied what they considered to be the best mode of carrying out the trust.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 26, after the word 'scheme,' to insert the words 'require the local education authority to comply with such conditions as to payment or otherwise not being inconsistent with this Act.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said he quite agreed that there was a point of substance in the Amendment. The condition of affairs was quite obvious under this clause. The local education authority had to take the trustees before the Commissioners either because of the terms, or in the event of the trustees being unwilling to be taken over, to ascertain whether or not the school was bound to be taken over owing to the nature of the trust. Therefore the matter rested entirely in the option of the local authority who, casting their eye abroad and fixing upon a school as being a desirable one for their educational system, accordingly endeavoured to come to terms. They might fail to do so, either because the trustees did not agree to the terms or because they objected to be taken over at all. On either one of these reasons, or because of both, they went before the Commissioners; he dared say the Commissioners would often visit the places, but it was not for him to say. He thought it would be unreasonable and unfair if, after the Commissioners had thrashed the whole matter out, and decided that the school was bound to be transferred, even against the will of the trustees or owners, and had fixed the terms, the local authority were to say, "We do not like these terms, and we will disregard them." He did not think that would be a satisfactory arrangement, and, without wishing to be reminded of anything he said before, he was quite desirous that this should be set right now. There were one or two words he would like an opportunity of adding on Report. Everyone desired that there should be as little litigation as possible, and that people should not come before the Commission and then discover what they might have known before, namely, that the trust was, for example, one of the alternative kind, over which the Commissioners had no real power. Therefore words ought to be inserted making it obligatory on the owners or trustees to give the local authority the opportunity of seeing the exact words of the trust, so that the owner might not be taken before the Commissioners ons peculation. He did not think this was a sort of tribunal that ought to be attended at great expense by great luminaries of the law. He hoped it would not become the scene of forensic eloquence and forensic costs. The matters with which it would have to deal were matters which could fairly be intrusted to the ordinary legal officers of the parties concerned and to the men of business connected with the local authorities. Consequently the authorities should be fully forewarned and forearmed. The proper course to adopt would be to omit the words "as may be agreed to by the local education authority and" in line 28 and the first word in line 29. The Clause would then read—"or other matters as the Commission think just." He thought that would fulfil his obligations and would also meet the justice and equity of the case. There was only one point which had occurred to him and that was the terms, and in regard to that matter he thought the local authority might very properly have a voice. Suppose the local authority wanted to take over the school for ten years and the Commission suggested fifteen or twenty years—that was a matter in which the local authority should not be bound by the view of the Commission. On the question of rent, of course, the judgment of the Commission should be final, but the question of the term was one upon which the local authority ought not to be absolutely bound by the finding of the Commission. He intended to introduce words which would make it obligatory on both sides to disclose their case to each other and make known their points. Subject to that understanding he would move his Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that in view of the statement of the right hon. Gentleman he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, to leave out line 28, and the first word in line 29."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

SIR E. CARSON expressed his satisfaction with the way in which the Minister for Education had carried out his promise. He entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that there ought to be an elimination of all those matters which might render the proceedings before the Commissioners nugatory. The local education authority ought to put their points before the managers and the managers should produce their trust deeds. He did not think there should be any very expensive legal judgments, because the trusts were not in such a flourishing condition as to be able to spend large sums upon legal proceedings. He thought they ought to do everything they could to save as much of the trust funds as possible for the purposes of the trust.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON also expressed his satisfaction with the concession which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) was afraid the concession of the right hon. Gentleman was a rather serious curtailment of the power of the local authority. It seemed to be open to the objection that the voluntary school owners and managers might be taken by the local authority before the new tribunal, and after costs had been incurred terms for the use of the voluntary schools might be held to be equitable by the judicial Commission, which the local authority might find extremely onerous. It was manifest that the costs incurred by the local authority in bringing the voluntary school managers before the tribunal would be an unjust imposition even if proceedings were limited in the way which the Minister for Education fondly hoped would be the case. He doubted whether the hope of the right hon. Gentleman that the legal fraternity would be excluded from these inquiries would be realised. He was afraid that the most acute legal minds would have to be brought to bear to interpret some of the clauses. What was the position of the local education authority in the presence of this Amendment? They were bound to accept the judgment of the judicial Commission for the taking over of these voluntary schools, and they might have to take them over on conditions which might prove onerous to the locality. They might even prefer to put up their own new school fitted with all modern requirements. Under these circumstances it would be infinitely better to make the local authority repay to the managers of those schools the costs of any such abortive inquiry. The local authority would be able to inspect the school deeds before they embarked upon the legal inquiry, and therefore under such circumstances it was quite reasonable that they should pay the cost of the inquiry. He did not think it was wise, in the interests of education, that the local authorities, come what might, should be forced to take over the schools even on the conditions which the Commissioners might determine. He earnestly hoped that the Government would, in some way, provide that the power now possessed by the local authority in the Bill as drawn should not be taken away from them.

*MR. R. PEARCE (Staffordshire, Leek) thought the Opposition would regret that this Amendment was ever put forward. The effect of it would be that in many places the local authorities would not bring the trustees before the Commission. By this clause the scheme of the Commissioners would have the effect of an Act of Parliament, without possibility of any review or appeal, and the local authority would be bound by whatever happened to be done by the scheme. The consequence would be that the local authority would much rather build a school of their own over which they would have complete control than take over a voluntary school. He regretted that the clause as it originally stood had been marred in any particular.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said that in regard to material things it was quite reasonable that the local education authority, having taken unwilling trustees before the judicial Commissioners, should abide by their decision. Under the section as it stood when the trustees had been before the Commissioners and a scheme had been drawn up, the local authority could say, "Yes, that scheme seems reasonable and we will accept it." But by the concession which had now been made that power was taken out of the hands of the local authority. When they talked of "payment or other matters" it seemed to him rather important that they should know precisely what those other matters were, and how far the powers of the Commissioners were to go in regard to them. Before this concession was made this was immaterial from the public point of view, because the authority could refuse to take the school over, but now they would have to accept the scheme and therefore they ought to know exactly what responsibility was involved in taking the trustees of a school before the Commissioners. There was a danger that unless the local education authorities were quite clear as to the responsibility they were incurring they would be very unwilling to take trustees before the Commission at all for the purpose of getting schemes drawn up. He appealed to the Minister for Education to consider whether the words "other matters" should not be more carefully defined in order that local authorities might know where they stood.

Mr. BIRRELL said the scheme contemplated under Clause 8 was a substitute for the voluntary agreement under Clause 2. The "other matters" contemplated were the rent, the term of years, it might be the time of day when the schoolhouse would be required, and things of that kind. His hon. friend was a little anxious about the "facilities." He himself did not see that the facilities had anything whatever to do with the matter. The facilities referred to were those given by the Act, and the Commissioners would have no power to extend them for denominational teaching beyond what was contemplated and proposed by the Act itself. He thought there was no occasion for the local authority to be nervous as to the terrible things that this Commission might impose upon them, because nothing would be imposed on them that was not within the direct legal authorisation of the Act. He deprecated anything being put in the Bill which would interfere with the local authorities desiring to take schools over which they thought fitted in with their educational schemes. The religious facilities contemplated by the Act were the only facilities which the Commissioners would impose on them.

Question put, and agreed to.

*Mr. CAVE moved to leave out "or repair" and insert "enlargement or improvement" in line 31. He said the sub-section provided that in fixing the payment for the use of the school the Commissioners were to have regard to the grants or assistance, if any, received from public funds towards the building of repair of the schoolhouse. He did not himself consider that any deduction should be made for building grants, but in any case he thought the provision should be confined to capital expenditure, and should not extend to expenditure on ordinary repairs. Under the Act of 1902 the local authorities had been paying for the ordinary wear and tear of the non-provided schools. The effect of the Bill would be that the cost of these repairs would be charged against the schools and deducted from any payment which the owners of the schools would otherwise have when taken over. To make a charge of that kind was not, he thought, a businesslike manner of dealing with the question. Personally, he objected to the whole clause, but he submitted that, at all events, the Amendment he now proposed should be made."

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 31, to leave out the words 'or repair,' and to insert the words 'enlargement or improvement.' "—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause.

Mr. BIRRELL said he quite agreed that the words to which the hon. Member objected were not the proper words to use. The proper words were those which were to be found in Section 96 of the Act of 1870, namely, "enlarging, improving, or fitting up." He asked the hon. Member whether he would move the insertion of these words.

*Mr. CAVE objected to the words "fitting up," and adhered to his proposal that the words inserted should be "enlargement or improvement," and not "enlarging or improving."

Mr. BIRRELL: I will take your words.

Mr. PERKS asked the Minister for Education whether the "public funds" referred to in the sub-section would cover monies which had been received by many of these voluntary schools from public corporations which gave donations and subscriptions simply to keep out school boards. In towns like Crewe, Rugby, and Ashford these enlargements and improvement of voluntary schools had been largely provided out of subscriptions from the railway companies given simply to keep down the rates. It would be very unjust if the Commissioners in settling the rent to be paid for the voluntary schools were told that they must only have regard to monies arising from public funds. "Public funds" was not defined in the Bill, and he wished to know whether it included subscriptions from these corporations.

MR. BIRRELL said he did not think it was possible for Parliament to inquire into the motives which induced these railway companies or any other subscribers to give to any fund. A great many public bodies conceived it to be part of their duty to provide education for the children of their employees and he thought it would be an impossible task—although the attempt would be one which his analytical mind would greatly enjoy—to ascertain the precise motive which induced either corporations or individuals to give millions or smaller sums. It was perfectly true there were towns where railway companies had subscribed funds for this particular purpose, but it would be impossible to treat their subscriptions as public funds within the meaning of the Act. He was obliged, therefore, to answer the Question in the negative.

*MR. LEIF JONES asked the Minister for Education whether the words "fitting up" should not also be included in the Amendment. He was not sure that the case was met by the words "enlargement or improvement." If money had been spent in "fitting up" it seemed fair that it should be reckoned. He moved as an Amendment to the Amendment the addition of the words "fitting up."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"At end to add 'or fitting up.'"—(*Mr. Leif Jones.*)

Question "That those words be there added," put, and agreed to.

Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) moved an Amendment providing that the Commission, in making an arrangement for the transfer of a schoolhouse to the local authority, should consider the grants or assistance received from public funds towards the building or repair of the schoolhouse "and the dates at which such grants or assistance were received." He pointed out that in old days the grants to supporters of voluntary schools were given under something of the nature of a contract. There was a condition that the promoters of the school should expend a similar amount, and when this had been done, there was no obligation remaining on one side or the other. Moreover, the amount paid by the Government for building Church of England schools was about £1,500,000, whereas the amount contributed by the friends of Church of England schools had exceeded £20,000,000. The beginning of building grants on a scale worthy of consideration was in 1840; and having regard to the deterioration of buildings which must occur in sixty-five years it seemed to him most unjust to refer back to grants given at or near that period. Moreover, they knew what strong pressure had been put, and in his opinion rightly put, on the managers of schools by his hon. friend Mr. Acland, to improve their buildings, especially in regard to cloak-rooms, class-rooms and out offices. In consequence of such demands very large sums had been expended, and the charges made were in some instances so great that the old buildings might really be said to have disappeared. He did not think the Government meant to act unjustly, but unless there was direction given to the Commissioners that they should take into consideration the dates as well as the amounts of grants, great injustice and great wrong would be done.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 32, after the word 'schoolhouse,' to insert the words 'and the dates at which such grants or assistance were received.'"—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said that the Commissioners were directed in very general terms to take into consideration the whole circumstances; and he thought it would be very undesirable to give too minute directions in that regard.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said that the question was whether they would do that without a direction in the statute.

SIR W. ROBSON said the words, "that the use of the schoolhouse for the purpose of a public elementary school by the local education authority" were sufficient to show that the Commissioners would consider the amount of the grant and all the circumstances under which the grant was made, and the present value of the school. It would be inadvisable to enter into too minute details in the clause of the Bill, and he thought the general expression was sufficient.

LORD BALCARRES said the only objection which the hon, and learned Gentleman had made to accepting the Amendment was that it would encumber the clause; but even if the Amendment were accepted it would not unduly overburden the clause, and he thought the Commissioners would be able to master its contents. At any rate they would be making it clear that not only the amount but the date of the grants should be taken into consideration.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) hoped the Government would accept the words. He understood the Solicitor-General to say that this sub-section directed the Commissioners not only to take into consideration the amount of the grants but all the circumstances under which they were made. The clause as it stood said that the Commissioners were to consider "the grants," not the circumstances under which they were made. He could not suppose that there would be any general objection to adding the words "and all other circumstances affecting the grants." The Amendment of his hon. friend or those he suggested would only give effect to what the Solicitor-General had stated.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY hoped that the Government would undertake to consider this question before the Report stage.

SIR W. ROBSON said that the meaning was sufficiently clear already. If they stated one circumstance they would have to state all. The general reference was sufficient.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY could not see what harm there would be in inserting words in the Bill enabling the Commissioners to consider the whole matter.

SIR W. ROBSON said the Commissioners were given a discretion which was indicated by the fact that they might take into view "such other circumstances as may in their opinion properly be considered."

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 152; Noes, 304. (Division List No. 195.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood,RtHnSirAlexF.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynel
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt.Hn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stuart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(AntrimS.
Craig,CaptainJames(Down,E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Gordon, SirW.Evans(T'rHam.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.

Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
M'Kean, John
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid).
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Francis Powell and Mr. Cave.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordsh.
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs. Leigh)
Brunner, Sir J. T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard K.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm J. (S. Pancras W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crossfield, A. H.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pacnras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Maj. E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hn. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon, Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton-
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn's-ssh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.

Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon. S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St. Pancras,E.
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donal
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central
Price, Robert John (NorfolkE.
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Chas. H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson, SirG Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H.(Ashton-und.-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Sir Edw. (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Sir J. L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Hon. Ch. W.(Hull,W.)
Wilson, J.H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir JT(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

LORD BALCARRES moved to insert at the end of Sub-section 1, line 32, after "schoolhouse" the words "the contributions of the supporters of the school to the maintenance and repair of the schoolhouse and the saving effected to public funds as regards salaries of officials and expense of administration by the voluntary service of school correspondents and other supporters of the schools." This would provide that these things should be taken into consideration in addition to the grants for assistance received from public funds towards the building or repair of the schoolhouse. He brought the Amendment forward by way of illustration of the matters which the Commissioners should take into account. The four sub-sections given in the clause dealt with topics which obviously and manifestly would tell against the trustees of voluntary schools. He therefore proposed that Amendment to give illustrations in an opposite sense in favour of the owners. If the right hon. Gentleman took exception to the precise words perhaps he would put in one or more illustrations to act as counterpoise to those in the clause.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 32, after the word 'schoolhouse,' to insert the words, 'and the contributions of the supporters of the school to the maintenance and repair of the schoolhouse and the saving effected of public funds, as regards salaries of officials and expenses of administration by the voluntary services of school correspondents and other supporters of the schools.'" —(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR W. ROBSON thought the Amendment illustrated the advantage of not being too specific. It sought to give directions to the Commissioners, but he noticed that it omitted all reference to contributions by the supporters of the school towards the building of the school.

LORD BALCARRES said that could be put in.

SIR W. ROBSON said that, as the Amendment now stood, the Commissioners would have to take into account the grants made out of public funds towards building, but not the amounts subscribed by the personal supporters of the schools. That showed the danger of trying to go in great minuteness into these matters. The Government could not accept the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked why the Government saw no difficulty and no objection as to all the things that were to be taken into account under Sub-sections (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv), which told against the owners of the schools, when directly a suggestion was made that there should be some balance—that suggestions should be made not for one side only, but for both, they suddenly became alive to the extraordinary danger of minuteness and precision. He did not deny that there was some force in the considerations urged by the hon. and learned Gentleman. He did not deny that there might be danger lurking in too great precision and microscopic and minute considerations in the drafting of the Bill. But if these cautious principles were thrown to the wind on the one side, let them be thrown to the wind on the other. Let not the right hon. Gentleman resist suggestions in favour of the voluntary schools on grounds quite as valid as those urged in favour of the sub-sections and on grounds which ought to carry weight in the Committee. He did not wish to speak too strongly on the subject, because he recognised that the right hon. Gentleman had done much to meet them in this matter. But he confessed the clause as it originally stood was plainly and obviously framed in favour in every respect of the local authority and against the owners and trustees when they came before the Commission. Some not inconsiderable traces of that taint remained in the clause, and if there was an objection to the words of his noble friend some better grounds should be found for resisting the Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL said that this was a matter in which the Committee was entitled to hear the views of the right hon. Gentleman. It was only reasonable to suggest that some directions should be given to the Commissioners to consider the wishes of the owners of the school if so many directions were given them to consider the wishes of the local authority. His noble friend had said he was quite ready to accept the words of the Government to his words were objected to, and that being so the criticism of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Solicitor-General of the words of the Amendment was no answer to it at all. The object was that the inquiry should not be one-sided, and that was an object that he hoped the Government would carry out.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 151; Noes, 310. (Division List No. 196.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Acland-Hood, Rt HnSir Alex F.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn HughO
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn. A.J. (City Lond)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beach, Hn. MichaelHughHicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. VictorC. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CharlesCurtis (Antrim, S
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, CharlesRamsay (Galw'y
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazelton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (BuryS. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar, (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants. Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Iver, SirLewis (EdinburghW
M'Kean, John
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Middlemore, Jhn. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, HerbertPike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Cheshire
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col, C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolf, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Samuel Roberts and Mr. Rawlinson.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, RtHonHerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r H'mlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.

Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce,Rt.Hn.James (Aberdeen
Bryce,J.A.(InvernessBurghs)
Buchanan, Thomas,Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt.Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,SirT.Glen(Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm J(S.Pancras,W
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies,David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies,M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancas,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, J.H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Foster, Rt. Hn. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward

Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife,West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield,H.Rendall (Lincoln)

Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN(Doncaster
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampt'n
Phillips,J.Wynford(Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh, Central)
Price,Robert John(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(BradfordE.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry

Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Hudd'rsfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) moved to omit sub-paragraph (ii). He said he objected to all four sub-paragraphs, but especially to sub-paragraph (ii), because he thought it was grossly misleading and unfair. Why should they direct the Commission to take into account the limited nature of the user of the school by the local education authority, when they were not to be asked to take into account the limited nature of the user by the trustees? It was well known that if this Bill were passed the local education authority would be able by structural alterations so to alter the schoolhouse as to make it perfectly useless for any other purposes than that of a public elementary school. He had in his mind the schools of Christ Church, Hoxton. He understood these schools were held under trust which allowed of their use both as a public elementary school and as a gymnasium and for other purposes. The London County Council had intimated that they must have the schoolroom divided into classrooms in order that the elementary school might be carried on. He did not quarrel with that, but the trustees of the school had said they would not allow a public elementary school to be carried on there after the end of the term, because the use of the school for other purposes would be put an end to. As the law stood at the present moment the trustees had the power if they liked to safeguard the other uses of the school, but if this clause were passed they would have no control, and the local education authority would be able to put up partitions or fix seats in the schoolroom in a way that would prevent its use for other purposes.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 33, to leave out sub-paragraph (ii)"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'the' stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL thought that some of the criticism of the hon. Gentleman approached what might be called without offence hypercriticism. There might be two opinions as to the necessity of the sub-paragraph. As the Commissioners were men of the utmost intelligence, integrity, and experience, the first thing that they would have before their minds would be that all that was required was that the local authority should obtain just that use of the premises for the purposes of a public elementary school—which was already going on, because one had always to bear in mind that they were now dealing with existing voluntary schools. Therefore they had not to consider the question of other uses to which the school was being put at other times than school hours. All that they had to consider was whether it was possible to continue the public elementary school on the premises during school hours. Although he would not mind one atom if these words were struck out, because they were of the very essence of the contract before the parties, namely, the acquisition of these premises for a very limited purpose, still he thought that, after all, these things had an educational influence in that they showed that they were not trying to drive people out of their own premises and destroying trusts extraneous to those of a public elementary school. It was useful that people should get it well into their heads that all that this Star Chamber—as it was once called, but which was now regarded as a perfectly safe and sound body—had to do was to consider whether the school should continue as a public elementary school during school hours on five days a week. That being so, he could not see what was the use of occupying the time of the Committee when there were so many more important things to be considered. The words proposed to be left out were as harmless as any that ever found their way into an Act of Parliament.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the Committee could not forget the Solicitor-General's speech of a few moments ago. The right hon. Gentleman with admirable ingenuity had discovered an argument that had escaped the acute eye of the Solicitor-General, and having nothing better to say in defence of this sub-section it occurred to him that, however useless it might be from other points of view, it had a very great educational influence. He now understood for the first time what the right hon. Gentleman meant when he said on the First Reading that this Bill had an educational side. He had discovered that it came in in sub-paragraph (ii.) of Clause 8. He was ready to accept all the educational value that was derived from this sub-paragraph, if it was made educational not entirely in one direction, but leaving the mind of the educated person in that well-balanced state which was the sign of true wisdom. He therefore suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should either accept his hon. friend's Amendment, or make a more symmetrical arrangement than the sub-section now presented.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 319; Noes, 149. (Division List No. 197.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W (T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H.(Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm.(Banff)
Black, Arthur W.(Bedfordshire
Bolton, T.D.(Derybshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, SirJohnT.(Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt.Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A.(Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Syndey Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T.Glen(Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, David (MontgomeryCo
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies,M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles

Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worcs'r
Harmsworth, R.L (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon. S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, SirJoseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. H.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N(Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E.(Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, SirG. Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A Lyulph (Chesh.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, SirA.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H. Somerset, E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)

Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E)
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex F.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn Hugh O.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn A. J. (City Lond.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasche, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ashley and Mr. Carlile.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY moved to omit the word "limited" from the subsection. The Government had again and again admitted that they only wanted to give general directions to the Commissioners as to what they had to consider, and that they did not want the directions to be of a one-sided character. In that case they should not insert a word which must have an injurious effect on one of the parties. His Amendment really carried out the expressed intentions of the Government.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 33, to leave out the word 'limited.'"—(*Mr. Laurence Hardy.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'limited' stand part of the clause."

Mr. BIRRELL said a limited user was the only user that was required, as the local authority would not be acquiring the complete freehold of the property of a school. He did not ask the Committee to admire the sub-section, but what possible object would be obtained by striking out the word "limited" he could not for the life of him understand.

Lord R. CECIL said it was a perfectly rational Amendment. It would greatly improve the drafting of this Bill, if nothing else. But it did more than that. The sub-section as it stood directed the attention of the Commissioners to only one aspect of the transaction. There was nothing to prevent the Commissioners under this clause providing a scheme for handing the whole thing over to the local education authority if they arrived at the conclusion that on the whole that would be the best business transaction for both sides.

Mr. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) hoped the Government would withdraw this word from the sub-section, because really to all intents and purposes these schools were monopolised by the proposals of the Government. Who could describe the occupation of these schools by the local education authority as a limited use? It was outrageous. The word would convey a totally wrong impression to the Commissioners, and would lead them astray. In the case of the Star Chamber there was some sort of appeal to the will of the Sovereign, but in this case there was no appeal, so that the Commission would be ten times worse than any Star Chamber.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY asked leave to withdraw the Amendment, though he certainly thought it exactly carried out the intention of the right hon. Gentleman.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*__Mr. LANE-FOX__ (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) moved to omit sub-paragraph (iii), which provided that the Commissioners in considering the payment to be made for the use of the schoolhouse, should have regard to "the facilities given therein for special religious instruction and the performance of the original trusts." He thought that involved an act of very great meanness indeed. He ventured to think that nothing more Jewish was contained in the whole length of the Bill. [Cries of "Oh!"] He meant nothing offensive to any Gentleman present. He thought the provision a most mean and sordid one. The owners of the voluntary schools had been trying to get the facilities which the Government had given with a very grudging hand; they had got infinitely less than they had a right to expect, and now they found that under this sub-section even these facilities were to be reckoned up in pounds shillings and pence against them. It was obvious that that would be the effect of the sub-section. After the appeal made to the Committee not to increase the number of details to be put before the Commissioners, he thought they might fairly urge that this detail should not be put before them. They might fairly claim that this should be left to the Commissioners themselves. He appealed to the Minister for Education to consider whether the miserable right of two half hours a week in the schools for religious instruction should be reckoned up as part of a financial bargain.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 35, to leave out sub-paragraph (iii)."—(*Mr. Lane-Fox.*)

Question proposed, "That the word "the" stand part of the clause."

Mr. BIRRELL said he was surprised that the hon. Gentleman should use such strong language. The fact that facilities were given went to the fulfilment of the trust. Surely the fact that the facilities were given was of the essence of the case. It was all very well for the hon. Gentleman to talk of this "miserable half hour," but it was, as a rule, the time which had hitherto been given to catechetical and formulary instruction, and to speak of it thus was both to underrate its value and the capacity of the children to stand more. The Commissioners might very fairly take into consideration the facilities given when estimating the rent. Hon.

Gentlemen seemed rather to suppose that these provisions put some burden on the directing wills of the Commissioners; they did not do anything of the sort, they simply called their attention to particular matters which they might take into their consideration.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said the Amendment raised a very important principle. The local educational authority, when considering the amount of compensation they were entitled to give to the owners, would look to these sub-paragraphs as being the basis on which the Commissioners would have to decide. The only test that ought to be applied was the market value of the user of the building which the local authority proposed to take over for a certain number of hours in the week. If more money would have to be paid in cases where facilities for religious instruction were given it would give a tremendous leverage to any agnostic element on the local authority. The local authority would be able to say to the owners that they would not give more than £25 if religious facilities were insisted upon, but that they would give £50 if the owners said nothing about religious facilities at all. There should be no higgling of the market in that way.

SIR E. CARSON asked whether the facilities in question were those in Clause 4 as well as those in Clause 3. If that was so, he supposed that there would necessarily be a different standard of conditions as to payment in the event of the facilities being given under Clause 4 instead of Clause 3.

MR. PERKS said the sub-paragraph which was proposed to be left out had a material bearing on Sections 3 and 4. He had been going to raise the same point as that to which the hon. and learned Gentleman's question referred. He entirely accepted the view of the Minister for Education that the facilities given for religious instruction were one of the main features which an arbitrator would necessarily take into consideration. A reference to the trust deeds would show that the main object for which the schools were built was to bring up children in, say, the tenets of the Church of England. It was admitted that this was not a money question at all. What was sought to be provided for was the future religious welfare of the children and, therefore, if that had already been provided for, and they came before the Commissioners, who he believed were all members of the Church of England, they would at once say, "This is one of the most material considerations for us to take into account." He asked the Minister for Education whether this subsection applied as to ordinary facilities schools where on two mornings of the week denominational religious instruction would be given, or to schools under Clause 4 where extended facilities for special religious instruction were given on five mornings in the week. Clause 8 did not come into operation at all where there had been inability to agree. Was the Commission to say at the outset of the arbitration, "What do you intend your school to be? Is it to be under Clause 3, because that would determine our judgment?" He wanted to know from the Minister for Education whether the provision for the Commission in making their inquiry did really apply to schools under Clause 4, which enjoyed extended facilities for special religious instruction. [Cries of "No."] Somebody said "No," but he wanted the Minister for Education to tell him that. Further, he wanted to know what would happen in the case of village schools where there had been no agreement, and where alone this section would operate.

MR. BIRRELL said he should have thought that by this time the thing was pretty plain. The Commissioners were to be concerned only with the duty of declaring and of seeing to the fulfilment, so far as they could, of the condition of trusts under which schools were held. The question of trusts did not apply at all to Clause 4. These schools were frankly denominational, and in regard to them what was to be ascertained was the wishes of the parents, with an appeal to the Board of Education under the amended Clause 4, so that they were beyond the purview of the Commission altogether. Then there was a question as to whether or not the schools under trust had been transferred to the local education authority. His hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University seemed to think that they would get rid of the facilities by offering to pay a higher rent; but he was quite certain that they would not be able to transfer any school against the wishes of the owner unless the facilities were given, and that these were sufficiently good to carry out the conditions of trust. The two positions were perfectly and entirely distinct.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY said he should like to urge the unfairness, if the Commissioners were to take into consideration in fixing the rent these extended facilities, that under Clause 3 no part of the living should be paid by the local education authority. They first made the owners pay for the advantage of the special facilities granted under Clause 3; and then under Clause 8 they fined them for having received them. That seemed to him an unfair method, for by the Bill the Government acknowledged the absolute right of demand. The only result was that the owners of schools were to be fined doubly for the granting of the facilities. The impression they had always had up to now was that religious instruction of a special character which was to be given was to be confined to Clause 3. It might be said in connection with the new Amendment that the Bill dealt with many other considerations under Clause 4, which would come under the purview of the Commission. He confessed he understood that this Commission had nothing to do with the question of facilities at all. The facilities were not granted by the Commission, but by the scheme. He was very glad his hon. friend had moved the omission of the words, for he thought that an extreme injustice would be inflicted when the school owners had to pay for those facilities and then to pay for them over again.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) said there were strong reasons for omitting this sub-paragraph. He called the attention of the Committee to the words of sub-section (*b*); the Commission may by the scheme make provision for the purpose of giving effect to the trust "subject to such conditions (if any) as to payment, or other matters — where "other matters" must include "facilities" for special religious instruction, as these would be among the essential conditions of the bargain—and the clause then runs on, "having regard to . . . . the facilities given" in the schoolhouse "for special religious instruction." Clearly there was a want of logical coherence in the drafting, nor was it possible to say what the effect of such words would be. Apart, however, from the form, the intention of sub-paragraph (iii) obviously was, as the Commission think just, that the rent of the schoolhouse should be, or might be reduced on the score that facilities were given for special religious instruction. He assumed that the local education authority would have already got the use of the school to the full extent they desired for the purpose of giving the particular form of religious instruction they required. Was it reasonable, then, because another form of religious teaching was being given in another room at the same hour, that the rent for the school should be diminished as if the rights of the local authority were thereby curtailed?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said it appeared to him that these words meant that the rent was to be reduced in schools where special facilities were given for religious education. There was a general feeling abroad that the object of all these provisions was to discourage parents from declaring in favour of facilities being given for religious teaching, because these facilities would mean the loss of a certain amount of money. He did not know whether this proposal would apply to schools coming under Section 4. He presumed under the new Amendment it would not. But a great number of schools would in any case be excluded from the operation of Clause 4, as the Minister for Education knew, through a variety of reasons, and they would be affected by these words. It seemed to him, looking at the matter in a plain way, that the sum total of this provision was that in schools where facilities were given for teaching of a particular class, a certain amount of rent would be withheld simply because those facilities were given. He thought that would be unfair. It would not be in order for him to discuss upon this clause considerations applying to Clause 4, but he did say that the proposal to deprive schools of a certain amount of rent because they had declared in favour of facilities did not seem right or just. He assured the right hon. Gentleman that these words did bear the construction that it was intended to discourage schools from applying for special facilities. Surely the Commissioners, who were gentlemen of great position and commanded universal respect, might be left to settle the matter without hard and fast instructions of this kind.

MR. BIRRELL said he was always desirous of keeping the loyal support of the hon. Gentleman, whose fairness he recognised, but he would point out to him that if the Government had not made arrangements in the Bill the Commissioners would not in such cases have been able to allow any rent at all. The Commissioners would have said to the trustees—"You must transfer yourself to the local authority on the terms of getting your catechetical and dogmatic instruction twice a week. That is the only way in which you can perform your trust. Therefore you have got to do it." Therefore the Commissioners would not have provided any rent if this iniquitous Government had not come to the assistance of the trustees by allowing the Commissioners to do that which the Court of Chancery could not have done — namely, give them a rent. But surely in considering what that rent should be it was not unreasonable that the Commissioners should be allowed to take into account the fact that the school was fulfilling a trust, that religious facilities would be given, and that the children would continue to be instructed in the principles of the denomination, in accordance with the provisions of the trust.

*MR. LEIF JONES wished to know how this provision would affect the schools in which four-fifths of the parents of the children desired facilities. Under Clause 4 the local authority might take over the four-fifths schools or they might refuse to do so. It was true there was an appeal to the Board of Education, but supposing the trustees did not appeal to the Board of Education, was it in the power of the local education authority to take the trustees of that school before the Commissioners and ask them to draw up a scheme? And in that event, could the facilities granted be facilities as under Clause 4?

MR. BIRRELL: If the four-fifths arrangement broke down, it would be in the power of the local authority to take the school before the Commissioners and then the only facilities given would be under Clause 3.

SIR E. CARSON hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would further consider this matter. He could not see in this clause any provision except that facilities were to be given "in accordance with the provisions of the Act" and he could not see that there could be anything in "accordance with the provisions of the Act" except in regard to four-fifths schools. Why were the facilities therefore limited to Clause 3? Clause 3, moreover, only applied to cases where the local education authority had agreed to take over the school and that case also was covered by the words "in accordance with the provisions of this Act." He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that the matter should be set right and needed further consideration.

MR. BIRRELL said he was always perfectly ready to consider a point. He was told that this provision was perfectly right, but he would look into it.

LORD R. CECIL said he really did not understand how the clause would work. It was said that the Commissioners were to have regard to the facilities given, but facilities were not given to the school at all unless they were given by the Commissioners themselves. He could not understand how they were to have regard to facilities given by themselves. Then the right hon. Gentleman said that this clause did not apply in some cases to schools coming under

Clause 4, but he could not understand how that could be, because under Clause 4 there were two alternative methods of procedure. The original procedure before the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman was that the school should be transferred, and that then, quite independently of the transfer, an application should be made under Clause 4 for facilities. But they had nothing to do with the transfer as the Bill was originally drafted. He agreed that it was suggested that the facilities should form part of the arrangement under this section, but under Clause 4, as originally framed, they were not part of the arrangement. Supposing in a school which would eventually turn out to be a Clause 4 school, negotiations had been entered into for a transfer but had broken down and the local education authority then came to the Commissioners and said, "We want this school." The Commissioners would then have to deal with the matter, and what they wanted was to settle the method of the transfer and how the facilities were to be settled, because no application for facilities, which was to be made by the parents, would have been made up to that point. How were the Commissioners to consider the facilities given in such a case? It was a matter which might not affect the rent, but which might affect many conditions under which the school would be transferred. The fact was that this sub-section was an extremely difficult one and he did not think the right hon. Gentleman had even now appreciated the difficulty. The animus of it was clear enough. It was to provide for a less rent than the owners would otherwise get. Taking that as the intention, was that a proper arrangement? Here were the owners who were going to make an arrangement and they wished for facilities which would operate for the benefit of the children. The Bill said that under Clause 3 in obtaining the facilities—and this was the effect of the sub-section—the trustees would get less for their school than if facilities were not asked for. In short it would be to the interests of the owners to ask for as little religion for the children as possible. He could not think that that was intended and he ventured to appeal to the Government even at this late stage to leave out the sub-section.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said the effect of the sub-section seemed to be that in certain cases schools which were transferred were to be penalised if religious instruction was granted.

*MR. R. PEARCE said he read the clause in this way, that where there had been no agreement made under Clauses 3 or 4 and no arrangement come to at all, then Clause 8 would come into operation. Under Clause 8 the Commissioners were to consider the best mode of giving effect to trusts and frame schemes. Under this section they would consider what were the facilities to be given for religious instruction, and if it were struck out no facilities at all would be given.

LORD BALCARRES pointed out that, with the amendment of Clause 4, the instructions given to the Commissioners, and the hint given to the local education authority, the Government practically settled that no transferred voluntary school enjoying religious facilities under Clauses 3 and 4 would receive anything in the nature of a rent. He thought that that was wrong. In order to carry on the trust school teachers would have to be found and paid by the trustees, and there could be nothing more akin to the trust than that payment should be made out of the rent to give the religious teaching for the provision of which the school had been founded.

MR. BIRRELL: I agree; that is the reason why this clause is in these words.

LORD BALCARRES said in that case he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider the wording of the sub-section in order to remove a genuine doubt as to the meaning of the words. There was one other point. If religious instruction had to be given out of school hours, why penalise the owners and trustees for using that particular hour of the day over which the local education authority had no control? Such a restriction was unjust and indefensible, and that fact alone was sufficient to justify the right hon. Gentleman in reconsidering the whole question.

Mr. HARWOOD (Bolton) trusted the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider the wording of this clause. because there seemed to be at present two separate and distinct views of what it really meant. He thought it should be made clear, because no one reading it would come to any other conclusion than that it was a penalising clause, although the right hon. Gentleman denied that that was so.

*Sir PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) also expressed a hope that the right hon. Gentleman would reconstruct this clause. The Minister for Education had told them that the Commissioners would take into consideration the matters referred to in the sub-paragraph in assessing the rents of these schools under sub-section (b). He took that view and thought the clause was wholly unnecessary and might be left out. Sub-paragraph (ii), however, was of a different character altogether. If sub-paragraph (iii) had not been put in the Commissioners would not have directed their consideration to the religious facilities provided, in determining the rent to be paid for the schools. But he rose to call attention to a matter of great unfairness that this clause embodied. It was suggested when they were considering sub-paragragh (iii) that there was no necessity to include the word "limited," and the omission of that word had been proposed. He certainly thought if the word "limited" was put into sub-paragraph (ii), it ought to be put into sub-paragraph (iii), because it must be admitted that the facilities for religious instruction under this sub-paragraph were of a much more limited character than they would have been if the school were held upon the trust. He therefore hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider these sub-sections so as to see whether they could not be left out altogether, or whether at least, the word "limited" could not be inserted in sub-paragraph (iii), so that the Commissioners should recognise the fact in assessing the rent to be paid that the facilities given under this clause for religious instruction were of a very limited character.

Mr. CARLILE wished to say a word or two in reply to the objection raised by the hon. Member for Stoke, who said that this was merely a question of money. If the hon. Member wanted to arouse the strongest and deepest feelings of hon. Members amongst whom he had the privilege of sitting he could not have made an interjection more calculated to arouse that feeling. Their opposition was not a question of money, but one of principle. He hoped the President of the Board of Education would see his way to insert words in this clause drawing the special attention of the three Commissioners to the fact that the so-called facilities under Clauses 3 and 4 were very largely hollow shams which did not give what they proposed to give and what the right hon. Gentleman doubtless thought they gave. As a matter of fact they robbed them of the right of ensuring that the children should be taught by people who believed in the religious instruction they had to impart. The facilities did not include what ought to be included and therefore this sub-paragraph ought to come out. He thought instructions should be given to the Commissioners that they should not allow these hollow shams to be referred——

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: I have given the hon. Member a good deal of latitude thinking he was finishing his speech. He must confine himself to the Amendment.

Mr. CARLILE said reference had been made to the terms of the original trusts. With regard to the teachers it would be apparent to all of them that under this section the performance of the original trusts not only would not be carried out but they never could be carried out under this iniquitous Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 256; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 198.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, J. A. (Finsbury, E.,

Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (Tw'r Hamlets, St. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, J.H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordsh.)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir J. T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard K.
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W,
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hn. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon. S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza-
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, G. H.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Donc'str.)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.

Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J.D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W.T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galw'y
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Sir Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lundon, W.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Seddon, J.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Evelyn Cecil and Mr. Lane-Fox.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) moved to amend the sub-section by inserting the words "limited nature of the," so that the Commissioners should be directed to have regard to "the limited nature of the facilities given therein for special religious instruction." The Minister for Education had pointed out that the use of the school by the local authority was limited, and he had inserted the word "limited" in sub-paragraph (ii) of this clause. The facilities given for religious instruction were limited also, and the words ought to be inserted because the limitations were similar in each case. The local authority enjoyed the use of the schools upon certain days for certain hours, and the owners had the use of them on a fewer number of days, but there was a further limitation that they had to pay for the teacher out of their own funds, and no teacher in the school could give the instruction. The limitations in the sub-paragraph affecting these facilities were of a far more drastic character. The Minister for Education felt it necessary to insert the word "limited" when dealing with the user of the school, and why should he resist the insertion of the word in this case?

Mr. BIRRELL said that it was perfectly clear what the facilities were, and therefore the application of any qualifying word was wholly unnecessary. He did not attach much importance to the insertion of the word "limited" in subparagraph (ii), and he did not think that it would be right to apply the word to the facilities in this case. The facilities given therein were in the schoolhouse, and the facilities were for special religious instruction. Those were the facilities given and contemplated by the Act. The words proposed were quite unnecessary because they knew what the facilities were, and to insert those words would be surplusage wholly unnecessary and would not convey a single idea which the Commissioners were not already fully possessed of.

Mr. BLAKE (Longford, S.) thought the Amendment was utterly useless and inadequate. It was not the limited facilities they now had to consider, but the facilities. "Limited" did not appear to be either truthful or applicable in reference to its collocation.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that if the word "limited" were admissible in the first sub-paragraph it was equally applicable in the second. The limitation in the one case was intimately associated with the limitation in the other. He was astonished at the argument used by the right hon. Gentleman. He stated that the word "limited" in the previous paragraph was useless but that it was there. But how did the word get into that paragraph? It did not drop into it like flies in the amber. Its existence in the clause was not part of the order of nature. If it was there it was there because the draftsman acting under instructions put it there. Why should the word appear in one paragraph and not in the other? The facilities were as limited as the user. The voluntary schools enjoyed the full right of religious instruction. The Bill came down upon them and declared that they would lose that altogether and they only got it back in the form of a reduced right under the title of facilities out of school hours. Surely the limitation was as necessary in the one case as in the other. The less facilities there were the less would be the charge for the payment of the teacher which they would have to pay out of the rent which they got for the limited user.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes 47; Noes 298. (Division List No. 199.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHnA.J.(CityLond.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.Sir John H.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Middlemore, JohnThrogmorton
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederick Carne
Rawlinson, J. Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield Ecclesall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, JosephA.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck. A, Cecil
Bell, Richard

Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex,Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, ArthurW.(Bedfordshire)
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton,T.D.(Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,Sir JohnT.(Cheshire)
Bryce, J.A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hon.Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinstd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Davies,David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Field William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner,Col.Alan(Hereford,S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor(Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N)
Horniman, Emslie John
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
King, Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W.H.(Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallett, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh, Central)
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'm't'n

Roberts, Chas. H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton-und.-Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan,E.)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Ward, J. (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(C'r'arth'n.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (S. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse,Lord(NorfolkMid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. BRIDGEMAN, on behalf of the noble Lord the member for East Marylebone, moved to insert the words, "Provided that, if required by the owners of the schoolhouse, any such scheme shall provide for affording facilities for religious instruction of a special character under Section 3 of this Act, and in cases satisfying the conditions of Section 4 for affording facilities under that section." The object of this was to carry out the intention of the President of the Board of Education expressed in discussion on Clause 3, when he said he would be ready to make it perfectly plain that if the local authority wanted the school and the trustees wanted facilities, then facilities there should be. As sub-paragraph (iii) stood it seemed impossible to make out the meaning of "facilities given therein," because facilities would not be given until this decision was arrived at. Unless the proposed words were inserted he really failed to see how the right hon. Gentleman could carry out the undertaking he had given.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 40, after the word 'considered,' to insert the words 'provided that, if required by the owners of the schoolhouse, any such scheme shall provide for affording facilities for religious instruction of a special character under Section 3 of this Act, and in cases satisfying the conditions of Section 4 for affording facilities under that section.'"—(*Mr. Bridgeman.*)

MR. BIRRELL said that under Clause 3 agreed facilities could be made a condition of the scheme, and a special provision inserted to that effect, therefore it seemed to him the matter did not remain open for consideration. Having regard to the operation of Clause 4 as amended, Clause 8 might require a little readjustment in language in reference to what was meant by facilities. He adhered to what he had already said: the four-fifths facilities being based on the wishes of parents were not the facilities contemplated within Clause 8. He did not think, having regard to the way Clause 3 stood, this question really arose.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON reminded the right hon. Gentleman that Clause 3 referred to an arrangement when facilities were to be granted, but Clause 8 rested on the supposition that the negotiations for arrangement had broken down, and the local authorities and trustees could not come to terms. The Commission would then have to take up the matter and deal with it *de novo*. It was really important to insert words to secure that the negotiations should be taken up by the Commission at the point where they had broken down with the local education authority.

*MR. CAVE said that if the facilities were refused there should be an appeal to some authority to compel them to be given; but under Clause 8 there was no such appeal, and no compulsion whatever.

MR. BIRRELL said that the facilities might be demanded by the owner.

*MR. CAVE said he could not find in Clause 8 any words which would compel the Commissioners to grant the facilities under Clause 3 if they were demanded by the owner or owners. There should be something of that kind in this clause, otherwise they would get back to the old gap. Apart from that, were they to understand that the Commissioners could not grant in their schemes the facilities provided in Clause 4?

MR. BIRRELL said he had stated that many times. The facilities granted in Clause 4 would not come under the purview of the Commissioners.

LORD BALCARRES said he would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to accept this Amendment. Its substance, it seemed to him, was perfectly sound in view of the decided pledges given to the House in answer to the right hon. Member for South Dublin.

MR. BIRRELL said that he had amended Clause 3.

LORD BALCARRES said that the right hon. Gentleman had given a pledge to fill up this particular gap, and he thought that he should in common sequence put in this Amendment. He attached great importance to the matter, because Clause 3 facilities would be of greater moment than Clause 8 facilities. A great majority of the Church of England schools could not come in under Clause 4. Therefore, they were thrown back on Clause 3 for the facilities which the Church of England required for their work under the trust. The right hon. Gentleman could not be surprised that they should press him to make it clear that those facilities were to be made a reality. If there was a corresponding Amendment in Clause 8 to that in Clause 3 it would then be clear that the Commissioners were bound to make the facilities under Clause 3 mandatory if they were demanded by the owners.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) said that the Amendment was totally unnecessary. If the owners made it a condition of any scheme that the facilities given in Clause 3 should be granted, then the Commissioners would be bound to make those facilities part of the scheme.

MR. BRIDGEMAN said he could not see in reading Clause 3 that the matter was so clear. There was nothing about the owners there at all. It entirely depended upon the decision of the Commissioners whether there was to be a scheme or not.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he would like the right hon. Gentleman to say whether, if the owners or trustees asked for facilities under Clause 3, the Commission was bound to give them.

MR. BIRRELL: Yes; if the owners or trustees require it as part of the scheme the Commissioners are bound to give them.

LORD BALCARRES: If it is part of the scheme; but if it is part of the scheme which the local education authority refuses to accept, and consequently the trust has to be considered under Clause 8, have the owners then any right to place their demands before the Commissioners, and have the Commissioners any power to order that Clause 3 facilities shall be given?

MR. BIRRELL: Certainly.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: With that assurance I will withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD BALCARRES moved to add to the clause, "Provided that in no case shall the rent fixed by a scheme be less than the amount which will be produced by a charge of 5s. per head of average attendance," in order to elicit from the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education what was in the mind of the Government as to the amount of rent to be paid. The figure he had put in the Amendment was a token figure; but after all 5 per cent. on the cost of accommodation per child, including cost of site and conveyance of land, was not excessive. In Lancashire the cost per child accommodated ranged from £12 to £15. The Chancellor of the Duchy had said that the sum of money provided by Clause 12 in the Bill would be paid to denominational schools for rent and repairs and he thought the right hon. Gentleman said that 2s. per child was a fair amount to pay for maintenance. He should like to know whether that was considered to be the rent payable under this arrangement.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 40, after the word 'considered' to add the words 'provided that in no case shall the rent fixed by a scheme be less than the amount which will be produced by a charge of 5s. per head on average attendance.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there added."

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.) said it was quite impossible for the Government to accept these or any similar words. They would impose a quite unreasonable fetter on the Commissioners, and it would be extremely foolish on the part of the Government to do so at this stage. He did not desire to go into questions of finance, because he did not think this was the proper place to do so. A statement had been published in newspapers which dealt with this question.

LORD BALCARRES said he had no desire to press the Amendment, but he did think that they were entitled to some more succinct reply than they had received from the hon. Member. No doubt there had been a long statement in Saturday's newspapers written by the President of the Board of Education, but all he could gather from it was that the Minister for Education said that educational finance was in a complete muddle and he hoped to settle it next year. It was no use saying that a satisfactory answer was given in the newspapers; it was much more important that a satisfactory answer should be given to the Committee at that moment.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said in regard to Clause 12 he wished to point out that it only provided for the payment of a grant of £1,000,000. That clause had nothing to do with rent, and simply provided that £1,000,000 should be advanced. It was impossible to say whether this Amendment, therefore, could be dealt with on that clause; he was not sure that it would then be in order.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON wished to call the attention of the Committee to the relevancy of this Amendment. The clause provided that the Commission should make schemes with respect to voluntary school buildings held under trust. It went on to give a great many directions to the Commission, some of which appeared to be important and some of which were admittedly unimportant. Further on the Bill proposed to provide for a million of money, which was to be given, he supposed, for rent and repairs. Under the circumstances it might be that the Government were unable to give them any answer, but he thought the request of his hon. friend was a reasonable one. Having regard to the variety of instructions which they had already given to the Commission it was not unreasonable that they should give directions as to the distribution of the £1,000,000.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said the question of the £1,000,000 had nothing to do with this clause, which merely dealt with the power to obtain schemes.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that of course he bowed to the ruling of the Chair, but having regard to the tenor of the Bill he thought the Commissioners should have some indication as to the line they were to take as to the payments for rent in return for the use of the schools.

SIR W. ROBSON said that the Government were not anxious to take more than was just, and he could imagine no worse kind of Amendment than that which they were now discussing. No form of instruction could be more undesirable than that which fixed either a maximum or a minimum. To take such a course might inflict great hardship upon voluntary schools, and it was not the kind of direction that the Government desired to give.

SIR F. BANBURY thought the answer of the Solicitor-General was a good one, but said it was different from that which was given by the Minister for Education. If the sum of five shillings was fixed it would bind the Commissioners, who might desire to give more. He suggested the withdrawal of the Amendment.

LORD BALCARRES asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) moved an Amendment to provide that the schemes of the Commission—

"shall be subject to the like conditions as to publication and approval by His Majesty in Council as a scheme made by the Board of Education under the Endowed Schools Acts and subject thereto."

He said that the object of the Amendment was that schemes made under this Act should be subject to the same provision as to publication and approval as schemes made under the existing Acts. They had no objection to the constitution of the Commission, but he did not think that any body of men should be freed from all control whatever, and no harm would be done if the procedure laid down by the Endowed Schools Acts were applied to these Commissioners. It was an extraordinary thing that in this Bill every one of the precautions to which they were accustomed in other Acts of Parliament was omitted. In every other case, including the Endowed Schools Acts, provision was made for the publication of the schemes, and time was given for objection. Under this Bill there was nothing of the kind. A scheme made by the Commissioners became operative at once, without the least chance being given for objection or appeal. If hon. Members went through the Bill from beginning to end, they would find that all the old precautions were omitted. He had not moved his Amendment on the Paper which provided that the Commission should not make any such scheme with respect to any schoolhouse of which the trusts had been declared less than thirty years before the passing of this Act except with the consent of the owners of the schoolhouse, but he felt bound to move the Amendment which he now brought forward.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 1, after the word 'Commission' to insert the words 'shall be subject to the like conditions as to publication and approval by His Majesty in Council as a scheme made by the Board of Education under the Endowed Schools Act, but subject thereto.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR W. ROBSON thought his hon. and learned friend could hardly have considered the effect of his Amendment upon the procedure of the Commission. It was of the highest importance that their procedure should be rapid, and that was the reason why the idea of the Commission was adopted at all. It was a very strong Commission, and it was one from which one could safely say that no appeal was necessary. The object of the Government being to secure rapidity, it was not unreasonable to desire that the decisions of the Commission should be final. For that reason the Government stood by the provisions of the Bill and could not accept the Amendment.

MR. BRIDGEMAN supported the Amendment. Rapidity had been urged as the great object to be aimed at. Considering the very short time the Commission would give to the decision of these questions in view of the number of cases, it was extremely probable they would make some mistakes, and therefore an appeal was necessary. Earlier in this clause they tried to obtain an extension of the date for voluntary agreements, and that having been refused it was still more important that there should be an appeal owing to the greater and heavier work which the Commissioners had to do. If there was this enormous number of schemes to make and no time to make them in—if rapidity was to be the one object that the Commissioners were to have in view—it was quite certain that there would be a considerable number of mistakes, and there would have to be some form of appeal. He therefore thought the Government ought either to accept the Amendment of his hon. friend or the one that stood a little lower down on the Paper in his name.

*MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) thought that if they had had no experience in this matter there might have been a good deal to be said for the Amendment, but fortunately they were not without some experience. The hon. Member had pointed out that the Charitable Trusts Act and the other Acts he had referred to had always contained a provision for an appeal. He himself was so impressed by what had been said in this regard on previous occasions that he had asked the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education for a return of the number of appeals that had been lodged under these various Acts. The return showed the number to be twenty-six, of which only six had resulted in the alteration of the scheme. The appeals, therefore, were quite a negligible quantity, and having regard to the confidence the Committee had in the Commissioners he thought this matter might safely be left in their hands. It must not be forgotten that the schemes made under previous Acts had been made without argument on behalf of the persons concerned, while the present Commission would give the fullest opportunity of being heard to those whose interests were affected. Seeing, therefore, that appeals had been so few when political passions were not aroused, and bearing in mind the possibility of the Act being made inoperative by an enormous number of appeals if trustees desired for political reasons to block its progress, he thought it would not be wise to give a right of appeal. It seemed to him that although, theoretically, it might be foolish not to have some appeal, looking at the matter in the light of experience it was utterly unnecessary.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said the remarks of the hon. Member for Wycombe were, to his mind, a strong argument in favour of an appeal. His argument shortly was that there should not be an appeal because it was so seldom required; but that made it all the more necessary that there should be a court of appeal, in order to prevent the least chance of there being anything in the nature of a miscarriage of justice. The hon. and learned Solicitor-General said the Commissioners had met with the general approval of the Committee, but he forgot that those Commissioners would not live for ever, and that others would have to be appointed, and they might not enjoy the confidence of this House in the same way as these three gentlemen did. He believed, especially on the Liberal side of the House, there had been a strong argument not for diminishing courts of appeal but for increasing them. There had been a question of a criminal court of appeal and other courts of appeal, all of which had received strong support from the opposite side of the House. But here they had a Bill which was going to affect the whole of the country and was going to create a sort of Star Chamber, and the Radical Party were going to allow the Star Chamber to be created. He hoped his hon. friend would go to a division, in which case he would receive the support not only of all hon. Members on the Unionist but of many hon. Members on the Radical side of the House.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the main reason advanced for declining to accede to this Amendment was that it was essential there should be rapidity. They had heard of the "happy despatch," and that appeared to be the method the Solicitor-General proposed to adopt with regard to the voluntary schools of the country, 14,000 in number. He had, however, no quarrel with rapidity if it could be combined with justice. But it was surely expedient that every precaution should be taken that the Party brought before the tribunal should be assured of the justice of that tribunal. The Bill contained no provision whatever for the alteration or amendment of a scheme made by the Commission. There was nothing to suggest that a scheme once made could ever be altered. A scheme was made by the Commission and after a certain date the Commission disappeared and no arrangement was made for anybody to take its place, whereas in the area of the school, with its shifting population, the whole of the conditions might be altered in five years. He desired, with the Solicitor-General, that if this Bill came into operation it should come into operation with promptitude, but he also desired that it should come in with the goodwill of the parties concerned, and that would not be the case if there was any suggestion that the action of the Commission was hasty and illadvised, or that a decision once given could neither be reconsidered nor amended.

Sir W. ROBSON said the point of allowing a review of a scheme not by way of appeal from the decision of the Commission, but a review at a later date rendered necessary by a change in circumstances, was engaging the attention of the Minister for Education.

*Mr. CAVE said that his Amendment did not provide for an appeal. Its only effect was to give time for consideration and objections. The clause provided no such opportunity, and that being so he must press the Amendment to a division.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL said he did not know quite where his Amendment, requiring schemes to be laid on the Table of both Houses for six weeks, stood with regard to this Amendment. It might be that they were the same in effect although they were quite different with regard to the working. However that might be it was not right that a new civil court should be set up without a court of appeal to revise its decisions. Under the law there was no civil court from which there was no appeal. They were now setting up a new jurisdiction—a new civil court without setting up a court of appeal. If the Government said at this stage of the Bill that there should not be a court of appeal there was a good deal more reason for calling this court a Star Chamber than there appeared to be at first. There ought to be an appeal. In the analagous case of the Charity Commissioners the schemes were laid upon the Table of both Houses, and the same thing was done in the case of provisional orders, and there ought not to be a new jurisdiction set up without some chance being given to revise its decisions. These schemes ought certainly to be submitted to Parliament.

Mr. PERKS thought there was great force in the suggestion that the schemes should be allowed to lie on the Table of the House, and he came to the conclusion on quite different grounds from those which influenced the hon. Member for Aston Manor. He did not wish to say anything derogatory to the Commission, but at the same time he had to express his regret that among all the experts upon this question it had not been possible for the right hon. Gentleman to find a Nonconformist or a Member of the Liberal Party to serve as one of the Commissioners. Although the Government had no doubt been guided by the desire to find the best men, at the same time it was quite within the bounds of possibility to find Gentlemen for these very important posts who might have given, perhaps, greater confidence to the Nonconformists of the country, and also to some Members of the Liberal Party. Therefore, he thought, having in view the extraordinary results that did sometimes arise in appointing to important positions men who had not altogether been tried, it was important that the House should have the opportunity from time to time in years to come to review some of the decisions, if they thought proper, of the Commissioners under the extraordinary powers with which they had been endowed under this Bill.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 116; Noes, 286. (Divisional List No. 200.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt Hn Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.

Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Fell, Arthur
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hn. Col.W
Kilbride, Denis
King, Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S)
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nolan Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby, de Eresby Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Asquith, Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J.H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black,ArthurW.(Bedfordshire
Bolton, T.D. (Derbyshire,N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J. F. L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner, SirJohnT.(Cheshire)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm. J.(S.Pancras,W
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Cremer, William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson,W.H.(St. Pancras,N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George

Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N)
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. H.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Scott, A. H (Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn. A Lyulph (Chesh)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End.)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H (Somerset, E.
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J.H. (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewellyn (Carm'rth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. EVELYN CECIL moved an Amendment requiring that a scheme made by the Commission should be laid upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament as soon as possible after the same had been made, and should lie there for six weeks, and should have effect as if enacted by the Act, unless within that period a Resolution were passed by either House rejecting the same. This practice was a very usual one. It was done in the case of the Charity Commissioners and in the case of Provisional Orders, and he thought the decisions of this Commission were exactly in the same category. It would secure a much greater measure of justice to the schemes and to the parties represented. It was a much shorter procedure than that under the Endowed

Schools Acts. It was entirely different from the last Amendment in that particular. It was also more concise and simplified. It was one which hon. Gentlemen who had studied the practice of Parliament thoroughly understood, and it seemed to him that in a matter of this kind where no appeal whatever was to be made, the simple, natural, and usual procedure was to establish a time limit during which these schemes should lie on the Table of both Houses, and during which objectors who had a *locus standi* could make themselves heard, and the matter could be decided by Parliament.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 1, after the word 'shall' to insert the words 'be laid upon the Table of both Houses of Parliament as soon as possible after the same has been made, and shall lie there for six weeks, and, unless within that period a Resolution shall be passed by either House rejecting the same.'"—(*Mr. Evelyn Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir W. ROBSON said he could not accept the Amendment, first, on the ground that its effect would be to delay proceedings, and, secondly, on the ground that it would not enable the parties to come to an amicable settlement.

Sir E. CARSON submitted that, since they were giving to the Commission a much greater power than even the Court of Chancery possessed, there ought to be some provision for Parliament to review their decisions. There was no precedent for enacting that a scheme should have effect without Parliament having any power whatever in the matter. There were precedents for giving power to make schemes, but in this case they were going a great deal further, because they were making them part of the Act of Parliament. They had been told that the Commissioners were going to act in the same way as the Court of Chancery, but all schemes drawn up by the Court of Chancery were subject to review in the Court of Appeal and if necessary in the House of Lords. Were they giving these exceptional powers to the Commissioners because the Government thought they were better judges than the Judges in the Court of Chancery? He could not see why they should be placed in a different position.

Mr. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square) thought they were entitled to some answer from the Government upon this point. No precedent had been put forward for such a procedure as this; in fact it was an absolutely unprecedented clause, because it deprived the King's Bench of the right to interfere even by the old remedy of prohibition or the rule of *certiorari*. It was astonishing that they could get no further explanation in regard to a proceeding which placed these three distinguished men in a position superior to the Court of Chancery and made their schemes perpetual. Surely they were entitled to some explanation to make their bewilderment less.

Sir W. ROBSON said the question of the terms of the agreement was a matter which would be reserved for consideration on Report, but as to precedent, the provision now challenged was adopted and adapted from the Church of Scotland Act, 1905, for which the Front Opposition Bench itself was responsible.

Question put.

The Committee divided—Ayes, 135; Noes, 299. (Division List No. 201.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A.J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hn. Guy (Winchester)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham).

Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Collins,Sir Wm J(S. Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark,Govan)
Fell, Arthur
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'd.)
Harrison Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.HnCol. W.
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
King,Sir Henry Seymour(Hull
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Redmond,John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts,S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,AbelH.(Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson,W.Mitchell (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Evelyn Cecil and Mr. Rawlinson.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J.H.(Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon Augustine
Black,Alexandra Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Bolton, T.D.(Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T.(Cheshire)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn.SydneyChas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.HnRichard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen(Renfrew.W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig,Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.)
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.

Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, EdmundG. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras,E.
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall(Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N.(Doncaster)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Pearce Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philpps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T.F.(Wolverhampt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt.Hn.E. (Dundee)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, SirA. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(S'mers't,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke-on-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(C'rm'rth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon.C.H.W.(Hull,W.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse,Lord(Norfolk,Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON moved to insert words providing that a scheme "may from time to time be altered by order of the Board of Education on the application of the owners of the school or the local education authority, and with the consent of both." He understood that this matter had already engaged the attention of the President of the Board of Education. He moved the Amendment for the purpose of calling attention to the extraordinary gap which existed in the clause as it stood. He did not suppose that it was intended that the Commission should be permanent. That being so, there was no power to which the owners of schools and the local education authorities might go for the determination of questions arising between them after the Commission had ceased to exist. Unless words were inserted a curious state of things might arise. After a school had been adopted under Clause 3 the neighbourhood might change altogether and the school be no longer needed, yet the local authority would be bound to maintain the building and the owners to provide the school. In that way the owners of the school might be prevented from using the school for some more useful purpose. Under these circumstances he moved the Amendment *pro forma*. He thought the Government had already considered the question, but he was sure that there would be great difficulty in working the clause.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 2, at end, to insert the words "but may from time to time be altered by order of the Board of Education on the application of the owners of the school or the local education authority, and with the consent of both.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. BIRRELL said that Part II. provided for an alteration of the scheme, but, as he proposed, with the approval of Gentlemen opposite, to move the omission of Part II., some Amendment would be necessary. He did not himself think that the Amendment of the hon. Baronet went quite far enough; and, therefore, it would be necessary on Report for him to introduce words which would fill the gap and carry out the object desired more efficiently.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL moved the omission of sub-section (4). It had been stated that there was an analogy between the action of the Commission in the case of the Scottish Churches and the power to be given to the Commission in this Bill; but he believed that there was no relation between the circumstances of the two cases. Whether that were so or not, this was a new Parliament, and Members were fully entitled to receive some justification for this entirely unprecedented and most remarkable action. It was more than whispered that this Court was of a highly exalted character, and that it would be almost an insult to submit its decisions to review. It should be remembered however, that Courts of the highest authority, manned by lawyers of the greatest legal distinction, experience, and skill were not ashamed to have their decisions reviewed. The Commission proposed to be set up by this Bill was at least as liable to error as other human institutions. It might err by exceeding its powers, by greatly mistaking them, or by inadequate interpretation of the language of the statute. He maintained that old principles should be adopted in the solution of new problems which demanded the highest exercise of the best judicial mind. The power of review was one of the greatest importance. He happened to remember the time when this House passed an Address to the Crown relating to schemes of the Endowed Schools Commission with no power of review. Some change was necessary. Shortly after a Bill was introduced and passed to effect a change by giving powers to review. He thought that instead of establishing this new Commission certain powers required in dealing with trusts, charitable or educational, might have been given to the Charity Commissioners.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 3, to leave out subsection (4)."—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out to the word 'and,' in line 5, stand part of the clause."

Mr. BIRRELL said that strong words had been used in reference to a provision which had not even the merit of originality. The sub-section followed the language of the Churches of Scotland Act of 1905. He thought that in a case of this sort, having constituted a Court consisting of a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and two other distinguished men, it would be absurd to allow an appeal in every case. It was essential that the Court should be strong, competent, and likely to inspire confidence; and that it should be allowed to carry out the object they all desired, a speedy settlement. It was true that the Commission would have to deal with very difficult questions affecting a large number of cases, but none of the forebodings expressed in old times in similar circumstances had been warranted by facts. There was no more remarkable and useful Commission of lawyers than that which was presided over by Sir Matthew Hale and which settled all the cases between landlord and tenant, leaseholders and freeholders, remaindermen and reversionaries, arising out of the Fire of London. That seemed going back a long time, but let anyone visiting Guildhall see the portrait there of Sir Matthew Hale, presented by the Corporation of London as a testimony of their obligation to him and the Court over which he presided. There was no appeal from their decisions, and they brushed aside the ordinary rules of evidence as then existing, and in the course of thirteen months an enormous number of cases were settled, involving immense sums, arising out of the Fire of London, which destroyed hundreds of deeds. All the cases were settled to the satisfaction of everybody and no appeal was allowed. Only one solitary peer made a complaint in the book of protests, that true home of lost causes, because he was shocked at there being no appeal. It was essential that the competent Court to be established under the Bill should settle these cases finally and quickly.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR had nothing whatever to say against the interesting historical review of the right hon. Gentleman, in which he went back to 1666. [Mr. Birrell: The same period as the Act of Uniformity.] The right hon. Gentleman assumed that the perpetual tribute was awarded to Sir Matthew Hale because he swept aside all the rules of evidence and forms of procedure, and he might ask the right hon. Gentleman if these three gentlemen were expected to perform a great public service of the same character. ["No, no."] Then there was no chance of their earning the immortality accorded to Sir Matthew Hale. One observation of the right hon. Gentleman's was unnecessarily controversial, when he said that no man who was party to the Act of the late Government in connection with the troubles in the Scottish Presbyterian Churches could object to this. But there was absolutely no parallel. The right hon. Gentleman had reminded them that this Commission would act according to the procedure of the Courts. The Scottish Commission had to deal with a great practical issue which was outside any mere legal decision, and of the three gentlemen appointed only one was a lawyer. There was no suggestion that they were to follow the practice of any Court of law. The gentlemen appointed under this Bill were a Court of law. He should like to ask what Court would have power to interfere with the Commission if sub-section (4) was not passed? If the Commission, acting within their powers, were to misuse those powers, it might be desirable that there should be an appeal, though he would be prepared to take the risk simply with a view to stopping interminable legal proceedings. But it was also possible that the Commissioners might go outside their powers. In that case, was there any power to restrain their action by any of His Majesty's Courts?

Sir W. ROBSON expressed the opinion that if there was reason to believe that the Commission had not acted in accordance with the ordinary principles of the Court of Chancery, and there was no sub-section like that with which they were dealing, it would be possible to proceed, not by way of direct appeal, but by *mandamus* or prohibition, by some order from a superior Court on the ground that the Commissioners were not acting within their proper scope.

In his opinion, this sub-section would prevent any proceedings by way of prohibition so long as the Commissioners did not go outside the whole scope of the Act. If they were to enact that money should be devoted under a scheme to some purpose wholly foreign to the general objects and purpose of the Act, in his opinion the right of the superior Court to proceed by way of prohibition would exist, but within certain limits.

*MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said he did not know whether it was the intention and desire of the Government that there should be a right of prohibition or some such power surviving to interfere with the action of the Commissioners if that action had been to travel outside the powers vested in them; but if so, he desired to impress upon the Government the fact that the language of this section was particularly ill-adapted to secure that result. It was provided in the first place in Clause 8, sub-section (2), that the Commission should act in accordance with the principles followed by the High Court, but the Committee must consider the effect of sub-section (4), which provided that no Court should have power to review or interfere in any way with the scheme or proceedings of the Commission. He asked under what words in this Bill, or under what common law right existing independently of the Bill, the Solicitor-General suggested that the right of prohibition could survive in the face of the perfectly clear statement in the clause. Did he understand the Solicitor-General to say that such an interference would not be in direct violation of the words of this section, which were that no Court should interfere in any way? He thought if the hon. and learned Gentleman had spoken a little more considerately he would not have given that opinion. It became necessary, therefore, to ask for a clear and distinct opinion from either the Solicitor-General or the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill, who had had the advantage of a long and distinguished career on the Chancery side. He contended that if they were to attempt any proceedings by way of *mandamus* or prohibition upon the Bill as drafted, and if they were asked how they could justify their claim to this remedy in face of the words of Clause 4, no living lawyer could make an answer which would satisfy the Court. He welcomed the statement, however, that it was the intention of this Bill that if the Commissioners travelled outside their jurisdiction they should be dealt with. If that was the view of the Government he should certainly ask the Minister in charge of the Bill to make some change in these words.

MR. PAUL (Northampton) said he had observed that upon every legal question of great general public interest and importance all the eminent lawyers in the House always differed, while the sensible laymen always agreed. He merely rose to remind the Leader of the Opposition that there was a Court, the creation of a recent statute, from which there was no appeal at all, namely, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council

LORD R. CECIL sincerely hoped the Government would accept this Amendment. The real point was whether under this clause there would be any appeal at all. He would, therefore, ask the solicitor-General whether he really suggested that there would be any means of restraining the Commissioners, however widely they might travel beyond their jurisdiction.

SIR W. ROBSON said that no proceeding of prohibition would be effective under Sub-section (4), but that he could imagine a case arising under the Churches of Scotland Act where the Commissioners had allocated the property to some other community altogether than either the United Free Church or the Free Church. That, clearly, would be going so entirely beyond the real purpose of the Act as to approach almost to the committing of an illegal act. Under those circumstances, he thought prohibition would lie.

SIR E. CARSON reminded the hon. Member for Northampton that it was not at all to be wondered at that lawyers and even Courts disagreed on these points. When lawyers were spoken of contemptuously it might be only fair to bear in mind that they rendered a service in this House in pointing out directions in which improvements could be effected in Bills. He gathered from the speech of the Solicitor-General that under certain circumstances prohibition might lie and that under certain other circumstances prohibition might not lie; but he thought the hon. and learned Gentleman would agree that it would be impossible to tell under what circumstances they would lie and under what circumstances they would not. If the Committee passed this section they would be opening the door to further litigation.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 315; Noes, 148. (Division List No. 202.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert H.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W, P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J.A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm J (S.Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H (Sussex, E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, H. J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major Martin (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes

Sir E. Carson.

Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, WalterRussell(Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mton)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd.
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-und.-Lyne
Sears, J.E.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomlinson, James
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn(Carm'rth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord(Norfolk. Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, SirJT.(Huddersfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William, (Cork, N.E.
Acland-Hood, Rt. HnSirAlexF.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. HughO
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael HughHicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cross, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(Lanark, Govan)
Fell, Arthur
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph

Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford)
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt.Hn.Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
King,Sir HenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long,Rt. Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lundon, W.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(RoscommonN.)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson,JohnFrederickPeel
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ropner, Col. Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, AbelH.(Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley,Rt.Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Francis Powell and Lord Robert Cecil.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, the Chairman proceeded to interrupt the business.

Whereupon Mr. BIRRELL claimed, "That the Question, 'That the clause as amended stand part of the Bill,' be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 311; Noes, 145. (Division List No. 203.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbo'rne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W.(Bedfordshire
Bolton, T. D.(Derbyshire,N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs. Leigh
Bryce, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J.A (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D .W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.HnRichardKnight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W. J. (S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, CH.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Cremer, William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (StPancrasN.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)

Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert

Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. H.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Gl'cester)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie

Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soares, Ernest J
Spicer, Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edw. (Salisbury)
Tennant, H J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset. E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rthn

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hn. C. H. W. (Hull,W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk,Mid
Wood, T M‘Kinnon
Woodhouse, SirJ.T(Hudd'rsfi'd
Yoxall, Thomas Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hon.MichaelHughHicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil,Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Claney, John Joseph
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway)
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Fell, Arthur
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt. Hn. Col.W.
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
King, Sir HenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
M‘Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh)
M‘Kean, John
M‘Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Ox'fdUniv
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put accordingly, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 311; Noes, 146. (Division List No. 204.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A.Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst

Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'wr HamletsS.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm.(Banff)
Black, Arthur W.(Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T. D.(Derbyshire,N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W.J.(S.Pancras,W.)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies, D. (Montgomery Co.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St. Pancras, N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-inFurness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Maj. E. Martin(Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Eve, Harry Trelawney

Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan(Hereford,S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herb. John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hardie J. Keir(Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L.(Caith'ss-sh)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon. S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H.(Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice

Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Cullum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N.(Doncast'r)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Captain Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford(Pembroke)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mp'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon

Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott, A.H.(Ashton underLyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edward (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowdon, P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L.(Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason,Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J.H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond(Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon.C.H.W.(Hull,W.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, W.T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse.Lord(Norfolk,Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJT(Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,RtHnHughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach, Hn.Michael HughHicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Fell, Arthur
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Houston, RobertPaterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
King, SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)

Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent,Mid.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Whereupon the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY (IRELAND) BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.) who had a Motion upon the Paper "That the Bill be read a second time upon this day three months," said the House had recently adopted an Instruction to the Committee in connection with another Bill of this Company, and it was rumoured that the Company intended to flout the decision of the House. They were to hold a meeting to-morrow for the purpose of considering the matter. It was obvious that the House ought to know the decision of the Company before it proceeded with the consideration of this Bill, and accordingly he moved the adjournment of the debate. The Bill could be set down on Wednesday, and meantime it could be seen what arrangements were made.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND seconded.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. MacVeagh.*)

SIR E. CARSON said he only rose to reply to one observation made by the hon. Member to the effect that the Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland were threatening to flout the decision of this House. There was not the slightest foundation for the suggestion. When the Second Reading of the other Bill was carried an Instruction was moved throwing certain obligations upon the Company. The Company were quite within their rights to say whether they would accept those obligations or not, and, as he stated at the time, they would have to consider whether under the circumstances they would proceed with that Bill or not. Nobody had any right to say that they intended to flout the decision of the House, and indeed that was the last thing they intended to do.

MR. WOLFF (Belfast, E.) appealed to the hon. Member who moved the adjournment not to persist in the Motion, on the ground that this was a very important Bill to the North of Ireland. The session was passing away rapidly and unless they got the Second Reading of the Bill to-day they might not be able to get the measure through. He submitted that there was no reason why the Second Reading should not be proceeded with at once. When the Instruction to the Committee which would have to consider the other Bill of this Company was brought forward, they very much objected to it, but the railway company were considering whether under the circumstances they would oppose it any further. The hon. Member had said that this Bill could be set down for Wednesday and in the meantime arrangements could be made by the board of directors in Belfast to carry out the negotiations which were proceeding. But those who were accustomed to negotiations between a railway board and the opponents of a Bill must know that they could not be carried out in one or two days. The directors would have to come over from Ireland and would have to consult their advisers, and considerable time would be lost by the negotiations. Under these circumstances he thought he was right in asking that the Motion for adjournment should be withdrawn, and the Bill read a second time.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) wished to know whether the hon. Gentleman was prepared to accept the Instruction passed the other night on the previous Bill if this Bill were passed.

Mr. WOLFF said it was still a matter of negotiation between the promoters and their opponents. He could not accept it at that moment.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said that was a conclusive reason for the adjournment of the debate. Since the House came to a decision the other night the railway company, through their agents, had threatened to drop the first Bill. If they dropped the first Bill, the Nationalist Members would object to their getting the second Bill. It therefore seemed a reasonable course for them to adopt to adjourn the debate in order that they might see what the result of the negotiations was.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Wednesday.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ADVANCES.

Order for the House to be put into Committee read.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) and other hon. Members objected to its being taken.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.) said the Bill to which the Resolution referred had been agreed to by all Parties, and this was a formal stage of it. Under the circumstances, as all the Conservative Members from Ireland supported the Bill, he would appeal to hon. Members not to persist in their objection.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY still objected.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) appealed to his hon. friend not to persist in his objection, as the Bill was unopposed.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY declined to withdraw his objection, and the Committee stood over till Tuesday.

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL.

Order for the House to be put into Committee read.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he did not wish at that late hour to ask the House to go into Committee on this Bill, but he wished to make a personal statement with regard to it. Certain Amendments which altered the phraseology of the Bill had been suggested, and it was also suggested that those words should be referred to the Law Officers of the Crown. In accordance with a promise given on a former occasion he had consulted the Law Officers, and they had helped him very much. Acting upon the suggestions which had been made, he was willing to omit certain words from the Bill and to replace them by words taken from the Food and Drugs Act. He would not mention those words now, but he hoped to be able to place them upon the Order Paper tomorrow.

Mr. LUPTON appealed to the hon. Member to accept the Amendments which he and others had put down and thus facilitate the progress of the Bill.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said that as a personal appeal had been made to him he might be allowed to say that though he was willing to accept any reasonable Amendment, it would not be his fault and he would not be responsible if they were not discussed. Some of the Amendments which the hon. Member had put down had not to meet his (Mr. O'Connor's) opposition, but the very much more serious opposition of His Majesty's Government.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the county of Tyrone (East Tyrone). Order (6th July), for resuming, upon Thursday, the Adjourned Debate on the Motion relating to the New Writ for the county of Tyrone (East Tyrone), read, and discharged.—(*Colonel Saunderson.*)

Motion withdrawn.

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 1.

Adjourned at twelve minutes before Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 10*th July*, 1906.

The Lord Oriel (*V. Massereene*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Report from His Majesty's Attorney-General received, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [H.L.]. The Duke of Norfolk (in his place) consented to the Bill.

Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill; Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bills reported, with Amendments.

London Squares and Enclosures Bill [H.L.]. (On re-commitment.) Reported with further Amendments.

Rochester, Chatham, and Strood Gas Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Watford Gas Bill; Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill; Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill; Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with Amendments.

North West London Railway Bill. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, the opposition thereto having been withdrawn; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The Orders made on the 21st and 25th of June last discharged, and Bill committed.

London Government Schemes (London and Penge, etc.,) Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [H.L.]. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill had been withdrawn. The Order made on Tuesday last discharged, and Bill committed for Thursday next.

Great Northern Railway Bill. Moved, That the Order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^{a}; agreed to. Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Dover Corporation Bill [H.L.] Returned from the Commons agreed to.

London and North Western Railway Bill [H.L.] Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments. The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Reserve Forces Bill; Dowlais Gas Bill; Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill; Waterford Corporation and Bridge Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendments agreed to.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3.) Bill. House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} on Thursday next.

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.] Read 2^{a} (according to order), and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899), deemed to have been reported from the Committee; and to be read 3^{a} on Thursday next.

PETITIONS.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL [H.L.].

Petition in favour of; of the Incorporated Company of Merchants of Edinburgh; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

EDUCATION.

Petitions in favour of denominational religious teaching in schools; of parents and guardians of children attending schools at Manchester, Cheetham Hill;

of teachers in schools at Chadderton, Manchester.

Read, and ordered to lie on the Table

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [H.L.].

Petition in favour of; of the Incorporated Company of Merchants of Edinburgh; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Report of Proceedings at the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of Representatives of Authorities under the Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888. Thursday, 14th June, 1906; Annual Report of Proceedings under the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts, etc., etc., for the year 1905; Report of the progress of the ordnance survey, to the 31st March, 1906.

COLONIES (ANNUAL).

No. 487. Wei-hai-Wei (Report for 1905).

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3664. The Bahrain Islands.
No. 3665. United States (New York).

SPAIN (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF).

Translation of the New Customs Tariff of Spain, with comparison of the duties leviable under the tariff in force prior to the 1st July, 1906.

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS.

Report on strikes and lock-outs and on conciliation and arbitration boards in the United Kingdom in 1905.

ARMY.

Committee on civil employment of ex-soldiers and sailors. Report, together with appendix; Minutes of evidence, together with digest and index.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.

Account of deposits in Naval Savings Banks and the payments thereof, and of interests thereon, of all investments under the Naval Savings Banks Act, 1866, and the application of the interest or dividends accruing in respect thereof, and of the proceeds of any sale of any stocks, annuities, or securities during the financial year 1904–1905. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL [H.L.].

Order of the day for receiving Report of Amendments read.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Loreburn): My Lords, there is one important Amendment which was made in Standing Committee relating to appeal in the case of capital punishment. Words have been inserted to the effect that rules under this Act shall provide that the Court shall be available for this purpose as well during vacation as during the ordinary sittings, and in this way such an appeal will be heard at once and without delay.

Moved, "That this Report be now received."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next and to be printed as amended [No. 156.]

IMPERIAL DEFENCE.

***Earl ROBERTS** rose to call attention to the unpreparednesss of the nation for war, and to the necessity for action being taken in accordance with the recommendation of the Elgin Commission; that Commission having declared that the true lesson of the war was that no military system could be considered satisfactory which did not contain powers of expansion outside the limit of the regular forces of the Crown, whatever that limit might be.

He said: My Lords, in opening the debate on the important subject of our unpreparedness for war, I would remind your Lordships that, just a year ago, I pointed out in this House that the Regular portion of the Army, either by itself or with any reserve it could form—no matter under what system the men may be enlisted—can never be numerically strong enough to secure success in a war against a European Power, and that it is essential we should have behind the Regular Army a large potential Reserve, sufficient and efficient in all respects. Subsequently at a meeting at the Mansion House I endeavoured to explain that while our very existence depends upon our being supreme at sea, the defence, not only of the Empire, but of these islands, cannot be entrusted to the Navy alone; and moreover, that the maintenance of our sea-power necessitates our being able to control on land what may be called the sinews of sea-power. In other words, that the military forces of the Crown must be constituted, organised, and trained in such a way as will ensure their being able to take their full share in the defence of the Empire.

Since I first ventured to speak about Imperial defence I have frequently heard it remarked that it is not necessary for us to have a large potential Reserve, for the reason that nowadays our Navy is larger and more powerful than it has been at any former period of our history. It is said that our Army has always been small as compared with foreign armies, and it is asked why, even admitting there was not in earlier centuries the same disproportion as exists to-day, should we not be able, in the event of Continental and Asiatic complications, to hold our own now as well as we did in days gone by. History alone supplies us with an answer to these questions. I think, therefore, I cannot do better than ask your Lordships to consider for a few moments the past history of the British Army, so far as it concerns the successes gained by our arms in European wars; from which I trust I shall be able to convince your Lordships—first, that we have never carried on a war that has been waged on sea alone; and, secondly, that, apart from the South African War, we have never won a considerable campaign on land by our own independent efforts, and that in all the wars that have made the Empire powerful military allies have given us the help for which a large potential Reserve is now needed.

The people of this country, my Lords, have been led to believe, by the stress that has been laid during the last five-and-twenty years on the necessity for our having a powerful Navy, that the safety of these shores and the maintenance of the Empire can be secured by the Navy alone. No one believes more firmly than I do in the necessity—the vital necessity—for our being supreme at sea; but what I want most earnestly to impress upon you, my Lords, is the fact—paradoxical as the assertion may seem—that our sea power was not won altogether upon the sea, and that it cannot be maintained solely by the Navy. We know from history that the Dutch were able to hold their own against us at sea, so long as their financial resources enabled them to keep up fleets at all comparable in strength with our own; but the Dutch sea power perished because of the military weakness of that country as compared with the overwhelming military power of France. Although the Dutch, with the aid of other Powers, were just able to save their independence, they could not overcome their mighty antagonist; and the immense financial burdens entailed on them by protracted struggles on land, crippled the finances of Holland to such an extent as to make it impossible for her any longer to compete with us on the sea. Thus sea power passed away from Holland and into our possession, mainly because of the conditions resulting from a purely military situation. This fact ought to teach us a useful lesson, for there is a parallel between our present position and that of the Dutch in those days. The Dutch had a land frontier, and sea power alone could not save them. We, as an Empire, have extensive land frontiers which sea power alone will not enable us to defend. And in our case, as in the case of the Dutch, prolonged and indecisive conflicts, resulting from an inadequate military organisation, would assuredly load this country with a weight of debt and taxation which would deprive us of the financial power upon which the maintenance of our enormously expensive Navy fundamentally depends.

The first point I want to make clear to you, my Lords, is, that our predominance at sea was chiefly the result of military events upon the Continent. And the second point, which I trust I may also be able to make clear, is, that in those events, as well as in the wars which have since won for us our present dominion, we never fought without allies, and that our successes were in a great measure due to the help our allies afforded us. Those allies, my Lords, acting with us in consequence of treaties and subsidies, did actually give us in the past the services, in emergency, of those large military forces which only a national Reserve, under the changed conditions of the world, can be expected to supply in the future.

The Duke of Marlborough, though his supreme genius cemented the Continental coalition, had only comparatively a small number of British troops under his command during the war of the Spanish Succession. But for the aid given by the Germans, the Austrians, and the Dutch—who formed by far the large part of the total forces in the field against France—Marlborough's famous victories could never have been won. And if they had not been won, France would have been enabled to resume subsequently, with her larger resources, the contest for the sea, and might quite possibly have obtained it. In any case, it was our own and our allies' military successes on land, by breaking down French competition, which made our sea power secure. It was the same in the next great historical struggle—that of the Seven Years' War—when France could not devote herself to the sea, because her resources were strained to the utmost by the conflict on land with Frederick of Prussia. The fact that German military power was thus distracting the attention and the energies of France left this country free to concentrate her whole resources upon the development of sea power, and upon that conquest of remote regions in North America and India by which the foundations of the British Empire were laid. Without the military aid of our allies upon the Continent, our own naval and Imperial struggle would have been far more protracted and arduous, and it is doubtful what the result would have been.

Then, again, in the third and greatest of these historic struggles—the struggle against Napoleon—although the French and Spanish Fleets were destroyed at Trafalgar, Napoleon was not prevented from extending his dominion and striking down nation after nation. What Trafalgar did was to give us the opportunity of reaching the heart of his power; and although this was accomplished by military means, it was not by our own military means alone, for the limited number of men we were able to place in the field in the Peninsula could never have brought about Napoleon's overthrow. There was the disaster in Russia; there was the national uprising in Germany; there was the revival of the military resources of Austria; there was the revolt of the Spanish people. In a word, there were enormous masses of men in arms fighting against Napoleon in all parts of the Continent, and he was exhausted and beaten in the end by superior numbers closing in upon him from all sides. Thus, again, as I conceive it, in spite of the brilliant part played by Wellington's Army in the Peninsula, we should have been unable to bring about our great enemy's downfall had it not been for the co-operation of the vast military forces of other Powers.

Our mastery of the sea was confirmed at Leipsic and at Waterloo; and it is largely owing to the military conditions and the military issues of those tremendous conflicts that our sea power has endured without challenge for a century. I have told you how comparatively few British soldiers Marlborough had under his command during the War of the Spanish Succession; but I think it will surprise some of you to learn the absurdly small number of British soldiers who were sent from this country to take part in the war with Napoleon, when compared with the large army we were maintaining in Great Britain at that time. We had actually on an average more than 600,000 men under arms during the years 1807–8–9, of whom a little over 33,000 were with Sir John Moore's army in the Peninsula, and later still fewer—only 27,000—with Sir Arthur Wellesley. In 1811 Wellington had only 58,000 out of the 471,000 men enrolled at home. It was much the same during the remaining years of that war; while at Waterloo, with 265,000 British soldiers in this country, less than 24,000 shared the honours of that great battle, the balance—43,670 men—of the Duke's force were made up of foreigners. Even as lately as the Crimean War we found it necessary to employ a German legion.

Two other points to which I particularly wish to invite attention are—first, that 100 years ago, when the population of Great Britain numbered only 16,000,000, there were more than 600,000 men under arms, while at the present time, with a population of upwards of 42,000,000, with far greater Imperial responsibilities, and with proportionately an infinitely larger revenue, the total strength of our armed forces is very little more than it was then. And, secondly—and this is by far the more important point—that Great Britain has never depended upon her own resources since the days of Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth, when it was enacted by law that every able-bodied man should be taught to shoot and fit himself for the defence of his country. I trust that from this glance at past history I have been able to prove to your Lordships that, in all the many wars we have waged—except the recent one with the Boers—our treaties and our subsidies have given us the aid we needed in support of sea power; and that, without such aid, sea power alone would have been an inadequate guarantee of our interests; indeed, the fate of our sea power itself and of our whole Empire would, to say the least, have been problematical.

If then the conclusion I have arrived at is correct, surely the question of the future organisation of our military forces requires the most careful consideration. The numbers of fighting men which have hitherto been provided by alliances and subsidies upon every emergency cannot again be provided with anything like equal certainty by the same means. The German races, who in every previous age have been our military supporters, have now become our direct competitors in trade and shipping, and it would be at the expense of their own interests if they were to employ their armies to help us in the future. The Germans now have acquired a military preponderance to which, in the judgment of many, no certain military counterpoise exists. At the present day we have, in Asia and elsewhere, as I have often pointed out, immense land frontiers for the protection of which we must be able to depend upon our own resources. Neither alliances nor subsidies would be of any avail for such a purpose. History tells us in the plainest terms that an Empire which cannot defend its own possessions must inevitably perish.

It is, as I have said, exactly a year to-day since I ventured to bring the matter of our unpreparedness for war before your Lordships' House. Since then, meetings have been held in this great Metropolis and in the large commercial cities of Liverpool, Manchester, and Newcastle-upon-Tyne. And though, to my great satisfaction and encouragement, the subject has attracted a greater amount of attention throughout the United Kingdom than I dared to hope for in the time, no response has been made by this House, and, with the exception of an infinitesimally small number, the more influential of my fellow-countrymen do not appear to give the slightest heed to what services our armed forces may be called upon to perform, or to satisfy themselves as to whether they are or are not in a fit condition to carry out the duties such services would involve. The lessons of the late war seem to be completely forgotten, no thought is given to the possibilities of the future, and the one prevailing idea seems to be to cut down our military expenses, without reference to our increased responsibilities and our largely augmented revenue. I confess I sometimes despair of the country's ever becoming alive to the danger of the unpreparedness of our present position until too late to prevent some fatal catastrophe. Nearly seven years have passed since the war in South Africa broke out, and one year has gone of our alliance with Japan. But the lessons that the war should have taught us have borne no fruit, and it would appear as if the nine years that remain of the alliance may pass without our house having been put in order. Surely the consideration of measures which have for their object the security of this great Empire should be given precedence over all other measures. The security of the Empire is not a Party question. I can understand there being differences of opinion on educational, fiscal, and the various other matters which occupy the attention of the Houses of Parliament; but I altogether fail to understand how there can be any differences of opinion as to the vital necessity for our armed forces being in all respects efficient, sufficient, and ready for war. For what other purpose are the armed forces maintained? And is there anything else in the world upon which our fellow-countrymen, individually or collectively, would be content to spend money without being satisfied that they got their money's worth?

Within the last three years two Royal Commissions have reported in the plainest possible language that the Auxiliary Forces, as they now exist, are not fit to take their place against an organised enemy. What response, my Lords—as I asked at the Mansion House last year—have these carefully weighed words of warning received from the country? None. Indeed, I doubt if they have been even read except by a very limited number of people. It is no use our having 671,511 men bearing arms—which is the exact number of the Regular Army with its Reserve and the Auxiliary Forces at the present time—unless they can be depended upon successfully to fight Great Britain's battles; and this they cannot be unless they are trained sufficiently to know how to make proper use of their arms, and are in a condition to justify the money they cost the State. With the exception of the Regular Army, including the 76,000 men in India, and numbering with its Reserve under 400,000 men, few of the 671,511—with their insufficient training, their lack of discipline and organisation, and their paucity of officers—could be depended upon to defend these shores in the absence of the Regular Army; nor could they, for similar reasons, and on account of the uncertainty concerning their volunteering for foreign service, be depended upon as a support to that Army.

No one can have greater respect and admiration than I have for the patriotic spirit which actuates the Volunteers, and no one can sympathise more keenly than I do with the difficulties against which they have to contend. It is because I feel that these difficulties are insurmountable, and that this must continue to be the case so long as military efficiency depends upon the Volunteers themselves having to make serious sacrifices both as regards time and money, and also upon the willingness of the employers of labour to treat their employees in a patriotic and generous manner, that I so strongly urge the recognition by the country of the first duty of citizenship—viz., military training, in order that every able-bodied man may be able to take his part in the defence of the Empire in the event of any great national emergency. The evidence given before the Royal Commission on the War in South Africa, of which the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies was president, showed so clearly the shortcomings of the Auxiliary Forces that the members gave it as their unanimous opinion that—

> "No military system will be satisfactory which does not contain powers of expansion outside the limit of the Regular Forces of the Crown, whatever that limit may be."

This opinion was endorsed by a subsequent Royal Commission, assembled under the presidentship of the Duke of Norfolk to report on the condition of the Militia and Volunteers, which, in referring to the Militia, stated that—

> "in its existing condition it is unfit to take the field for the defence of this country."

Alluding to the Volunteers, the Commission reported that—

> "neither the musketry nor the tactical training of the rank and file would enable it to face, with prospect of success, the troops of a Continental army."

And again that—

> "in view of the unequal military education of the officers, the limited training of the men, and the defects in equipment and organisation, the Volunteer force is not qualified to take the field against a Regular Army."

The Commission wound up their Report by unanimously declaring that the—

> "Militia and Volunteer Forces have not at present either the strength or military efficiency required to enable them to fulfil the functions for which they exist; their military efficiency would be much increased by the adoption of the measures set forth in the fourth section of this Report, which would make them valuable auxiliaries to the Regular Army; but a Home Defence Army capable, in the absence of the whole or the greater portion of the Regular Forces, of protecting this country against invasion, can be raised and maintained only on the principle that it is the duty of every citizen of military age and sound physique to be trained for the

national defence, and to take part in it should emergency arise."

Even if such strongly expressed opinions carry no weight, it is incomprehensible to me how people who know the time and trouble that are expended in making the soldiers of the Regular Army fit to take the field, and that, when they are called upon to fight, they are commanded and led by officers who have made the Army their profession—it is, I say, incomprehensible how they can believe that the honour and safety of their country can be entrusted to men who have had scarcely any training, and who would be commanded and led by officers whose time is so completely occupied by their civil callings that it is an impossibility for them to learn all that it is essential for them to know. To be of any use, both officers and men must undergo a course of military education before they have to work for their own livelihood.

Nothing, my Lords, can be more misleading than for the people of this country to be told—as unfortunately they have been told by persons in responsible positions — that if only our Navy is maintained in all respects efficient there will be plenty of time after war breaks out to drill our soldiers. The fallacy of such a statement was proved beyond dispute during the war in South Africa, when we were given a greater amount of breathing time than could possibly be expected if we were called upon to fight a first-class military Power, for up to the very last, when the war had been going on for more than two years, men had to be hurried out inadequately drilled and positively unable to shoot or ride. I have no hesitation in giving it as my opinion that it is criminal for a nation, and especially criminal for its rulers, to enter upon a war without having trained soldiers sufficient in number to justify their having every reasonable hope of carrying it to a successful issue.

It is not necessary, nor indeed would it be possible, to have the whole number of men that would be required during a lengthened campaign ready at the very commencement; but if we wish to render this country safe under all circumstances and to maintain the integrity of the Empire we must have, in addition to a suitably-sized Regular Army, a sufficient and efficient Reserve large enough to enable 500,000 men to be at once mobilised, and, in addition, an organisation by means of which less highly-trained men could be rapidly turned out to replace the wastage of war, which, even under the most favourable conditions. must inevitably be serious. Officers are the most important part of an army, and of these not only is there scarcely any reserve, but, as I have already pointed out, some 7,000 are needed to bring the Militia and Volunteers up to their full complement, and to mobilise the Regular Forces at home and in India.

In order to secure a sufficient supply of officers some special organisation is necessary. It is upon the officers that responsibility rests, and on whom failure or success mainly depends. In order to carry out their work in a satisfactory manner officers must have confidence in themselves, and this they can never have if they feel they have but a superficial knowledge of the duties they may be called upon to perform. I cannot too strongly impress upon this House the supremely important fact that we can never hope to be ready for war without there being a very large reserve of properly trained officers. Surely the time has come for the leaders of this nation to point out to their fellow-countrymen, who look to them for guidance, how essential it is seriously to consider the actual condition of our armed forces, and not to permit another year to pass without satisfying themselves that all necessary measures are being taken to render those forces in every respect fitted for the services they may at any time be called upon to undertake.

Do not, I implore you, my Lords, suffer our fellow-countrymen to continue any longer under the misconception that a small Regular Army is all that is needed for the security of India and other places; that the defence of these islands can be entrusted to insufficiently-trained, insufficiently-officered Auxiliary Forces; and that it will be time enough when war breaks out or is imminent to arrange for the large Reserve that will inevitably be required. My Lords, the Regular Army is only just numerically strong enough to admit of its policing the Empire in times of peace and of carrying on the small wars to which our widely scattered possessions will always render us liable. To enable the Regular Army to hold its own against the carefully organised forces of a European Power and to ensure the safety of these shores, we must have a properly constituted, thoroughly well-organised, and efficiently-trained potential Reserve; and such a Reserve can never exist unless it is composed of all classes, high and low, rich and poor—men who will consider it not only a duty, but an honour and a privilege, to hold themselves in readiness to take their part in the defence of the Empire should their services be required in the event of any great national emergency.

THE EARL OF DUNDONALD: My Lords, no words of mine can add to the arguments so ably presented to you by that great master of his work, the noble Earl, in favour of adequate Reserves for our Regular Army. A combination of circumstances, mainly the pluck of past generations of our countrymen, has given us this great Empire, but are we doing our best to render secure and maintain what we have inherited? The most moderate proposals made after careful study of our requirements are met, as to a considerable section of the people, by apathy; as to another section of the people, by hostility. I received only the other day a leaflet from some earnest, and, I believe, excellent man, against the military training of boys; and there are tens of thousands in this country who hold the same views, and call anything appertaining to the adequate defence of the land in which they dwell in peace, militarism. Militarism, I need not remind your Lordships, as described in any dictionary, consists in the abnormal development of the military spirit, but can the elementary preparation of the youth of the country to take their place in the battle line from which their forefathers have never shrunk, be designated by the extreme, and I may add in such a connection as this, hysterical epithet of militarism?

I do not favour, my Lords, compulsory service for the adult, but I do think that no time should be lost in training the youth of the country, before they have become immersed in the business of their lives, to a knowledge of the rifle and in military drill. One hundred compulsory drills between the ages of thirteen and seventeen would be quite sufficient as a minimum; the youth of the country would be benefited by this training, and it would then become possible to call into being, at short notice, a large citizen Army. I do not believe, my Lords, that it will ever be possible to create a large unpaid Volunteer or citizen Army, unless recruits have done the drudgery and elementary work of soldiering in their school-boy days. Only by such training on a large scale can we arrive at a great reservoir of military strength which could provide the men, when the time came, to defend not only the shores of their country, but the territory of the Empire wherever threatened.

I hope that the Government will take in hand seriously the question of the provision of a great corps of trained officers and non-commissioned officers; in this respect we are lamentably deficient, and bear in mind, my Lords, leaders cannot be improvised. Just as there are tens of thousands of men in this country who cannot give the whole of their time to military pursuits, so there are thousands of men who would make good and intelligent leaders if they were encouraged to devote a portion of their time to the acquirement of the necessary knowledge. Why cannot the services of these men be utilised? Why cannot, for example, every officer and non-commissioned officer in every regiment in the United Kingdom have his understudy, under agreement to do a certain amount of training in the year? A reserve of thousands of well-trained leaders we must have, and I hope the Government will endeavour to create this Reserve by every means in its power.

While on this subject, I cannot but express my regret at the short-sighted policy that has driven from the Army large numbers of men, and first-rate leaders of men, who declined to conform to the idea that for a bare pittance of pay they should give up every occupation of their position in life, in exchange for the humdrum existence of a junior officer. I should like to place down on paper the number of hours in a year actually utilised by an ordinary regimental officer in the performance of those duties actually necessary to an officer for his perfection as a leader of men in the field. Your Lordships would be astonished at the number of hours spent in the performance of duties connected with the health, dress, discipline, etc., of the men committed to their care, and at the comparatively few number of hours devoted to actual fighting knowledge.

There are only two ways of obtaining good officers in this country—by paying them well, or by largely utilising in a sensible manner the services of that great class who do not serve mainly for remuneration, but who have hitherto led British soldiers into action, and under whose leadership, let me remind your Lordships, the vast territories now forming the British Empire have been won and held. The mediæval system of education at our great centres of instruction has, in the past, been largely instrumental in turning out young men of our leisured classes unfit for practical work, and it has been responsible for many shortcomings for which a young officer has been termed stupid, whereas fault ought to have been found with a system of education which stuffed his head with a lot of material which he tried to forget as soon as possible. If I had to go away to-morrow to undertake some important military work, I would rather have as A.D.C. a young man who knew how to file and keep papers, could write shorthand and express himself on paper in clear good English, than a man who could write Latin verses, or was an adept at higher mathematics and was a child as regards the ordinary routine of business; for soldiering, my Lords, is nothing more than a business which has to be run on business lines by practical men.

There is one other point I would like to enlarge upon if time permitted, but I will confine myself to expressing the hope that if we are to have a Militia Army liable to service abroad in time of war, money will not be spent on barracks, but on training and in pay. It is in the power of the Government, by largely training men at company centres throughout the country at convenient times of the year, to keep a large number of men on the land and in this way to help counteract the rush to the urban centres. The subsidy or bonus—call it what you like—will, with a man's wages in civil life, largely help in this desirable direction.

I am fully aware that the question of finance must decide what sort of force can be kept up in this country, but I believe that the best value for our money will be obtained by keeping in being well-trained skeletons, with first-rate and highly-trained leaders, which can be clothed with the flesh and blood of good rifle shots when war breaks out, rather than by keeping in being a larger force of men with a uniformity of instruction of a mediocre character. This was the system which, after full consideration of the requirements of a citizen Army, I urged the Government of Canada to adopt on the score of economy and efficiency, and which they did adopt. I have already spoken long enough, but before concluding I would like to call your attention to another important paragraph in the Elgin Report—

> "If the war teaches anything it is this, that throughout the Empire, in the United Kingdom, its colonies and dependencies, there is a reserve of military strength which for many reasons, we cannot and do not wish to convert into a vast standing army, but to which we may be glad to turn again in our hour of need, as we did in 1889. In that year there was no preparation whatever for utilising these great resources."

My Lords, these words are clear and unambiguous, and represent the true state of affairs. In this connection I do not think it is sufficiently known in this country how splendidly the Militia of Canada came forward when they thought the Motherland required their services. Not individuals only, but regiment after regiment volunteered as a whole; and mind you, my Lords, these were men who were only embodied for twelve days training in the year. I may say that though some 8,000 Canadian soldiers went to South Africa, many times that number were eager to go, even officers throwing up their commissions and serving in the ranks as privates.

What provision have we made adequately to utilise the services of all the patriotic British who dwell beyond the seas? Why cannot we, by bonusing individuals or by bonusing regiments so as to enable them to do more training, be able to count upon the services of a large and well-trained Reserve in our great Colonies? I do not know what steps have been taken by this or the previous Government to utilise the services of the loyal Militia of Canada, and the other great self-governing Colonies in the event of a great war affecting the Empire; but this much I can say, and I can assure your Lordships with a full knowledge of the facts, and speaking only for the Militia of Canada, that we may count upon every officer and man in that Militia coming forward in defence of our common Empire. They would come forward on sentimental grounds, freely giving their services and asking nothing in return; but however patriotic a man may be, he appreciates the usual official signs of gratitude for service in time of war.

I cannot say, my Lords, that those in responsible executive positions here have done their best to encourage our Colonial brethren to throw up lucrative employment and again come forward to risk the uncertainties of a campaign. Those only who know the soldier realise how much he values that little bit of ribbon presented on behalf of a grateful country to those who help it in its hour of need. Towards the expiration of the war, various regiments were raised in Canada for service in South Africa. Some of these regiments, unfortunately, did not land in time before the conclusion of peace, but were actually in South African waters. On the return of these men, I was inundated with letters asking if the Imperial authorities would not grant them the South African medal. I, as general officer commanding, strongly recommended that their request should be granted, but the application was refused. I must here say emphatically that the decision arrived at was most illogical and most unwise. I grant that the refusal was in accordance with the precedent of late years of over-ruling and ignoring the opinion and advice of the man at the wheel, who cannot—or perhaps I should say must not—know as much as the man in charge at home. Many of the men who went to South Africa pointed out in their letters to me that their places had been filled up and they were now serving at half the remuneration they had previously received; others said they could get no employment and were in a bad way. If the South African medal had been strictly confined to all those who had been actually on South African soil, no Canadian soldier would have found fault with the decision of the authorities at home, but this is not so. Medals have been distributed to persons who have never seen South Africa or been as near to it as the men who were denied it. I trust that even in this eleventh hour the Government will see fit, in the interests of even-handed justice, and in the interests of the Empire, to be logical in the distribution of what ought to be the emblems of a nation's gratitude.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): My Lords, the Motion of the noble and gallant Earl calls attention to the unpreparedness of the nation for war. I am afraid I cannot say how far the nation is prepared for war. That is not purely a military question. In the case of war with some great Power or Powers the struggle to the nation, a vital struggle of life and death, would be both long and costly. However perfect our military organisation, however brave our troops, the credit of the nation would be most essential. I cannot help feeling that the taxable capacity of the community and its financial reserve power are forces which would form a most important factor in determining the preparedness of the nation for war. I am afraid I cannot this evening embark upon so large, so indefinite, a question as the preparedness or not of the nation for war; but, speaking on behalf of the Army Council, I am glad to see that the noble and gallant Earl has withdrawn the statement which he made in his speech in your Lordships' House on July 10th of last year, that the armed forces as a body are as absolutely unfitted and unprepared for war as they were in 1899 and 1900.

EARL ROBERTS: That is a statement I repeat now.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: The noble Earl repeats that statement now; but, in his recently published volume of speeches and letters, he makes this correction—

> "Since these words have been represented as implying that the tactical lessons of the war have not been taken to heart by the Regular Army—an entirely erroneous idea which I had no wish to convey—I would here substitute the words 'the nation' for the phrase 'armed Forces as a body.'"

I understand from the noble and gallant Earl that he now returns to the statement that the armed forces as a body are as absolutely unfitted and unprepared for war as they were in 1899 and 1900.

EARL ROBERTS: My remark about the Regular Forces was misconstrued. I never said a word against the Regular Forces. I said that the armed Forces of the Crown, taken as a body, were not more fit for war now than they were in 1899. I was talking about the recommendation made by the Commission presided over by the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that outside the Regular Army there should be a power of expansion. Nothing has been done to bring that about. That was what I was alluding to last year and what I allude to now.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I do not wish to enter into any controversy with the noble and gallant Earl if I can avoid it. I think the question of expansion is a totally different matter. If the noble and gallant Earl adheres to the statement that the armed forces of the Crown are in a condition of unpreparedness as great as they were in 1899 and 1900, then he, as Commander-in-Chief for three years and a half after the South African War was over, must have some of the responsibility. I am perfectly certain he would have received from the Government of the day support for any reasonable measure he might have suggested.

As regards action being taken in accordance with the recommendations of the Elgin Commission to expand the military system outside the limit of the Regular Forces of the Crown, the noble and gallant Earl is doubtless aware—in fact he must be—that this idea has been and is being, thoroughly discussed by a very representative Committee appointed by the War Office, of which Committee he is a distinguished member. It may be readily admitted that this is only a preliminary step, but the subject is a very large one, and the adoption of any measure in this direction will require very careful consideration and legislative action before it can be put in force. The great difficulty in our military system is that whereas other countries can shape their peace organisation in accordance with war requirements, we cannot do so. In fact, with us peace and war requirements are often not only not in harmony with, but directly antagonistic to, each other.

Take the terms of service. If it were not for the necessity of finding drafts in peace for service abroad we should never think of keeping men over two or three years with the colours, but that necessity compels us to retain men for at least seven years—we cannot find the drafts with less. The unfortunate experiment of enlistment for three years colour service, for which the noble and gallant Earl has honourably admitted a large share of responsibility, has landed the War Office in a mass of difficulties, to cope with which has taken up a great deal of the time and attention, not only of the present Secretary of State, but of his predecessor also, and considering the short time he has been in office I do not think Mr. Haldane can justly be accused of procrastination. It is worth noting that Mr. Cardwell came into office late in 1868, but did not carry out any important reform till the session of 1870 was well advanced. The Secretary of State is to make an important statement on Thursday, from which it will be seen that he has by no means neglected the question of a territorial Army, but time has not admitted of any plan being fully considered, still less carried out.

It must be noted that no drastic scheme of reorganisation can be completed and be in full working order for many years. This we have found to our cost in remedying the breakdown of the three years enlistment, a breakdown which, however, has a great redeeming feature in that it has provided us with a very much larger Reserve than we have ever had before. I appreciate fully the self-restraint which the noble and gallant Earl has exercised in dealing with the question of the territorial Army. I cannot say more this afternoon than that we hope it may be agreeable to Parliament and to the Militia as part of a great general scheme to make them a living support to the Regular Army, while retaining, as far as possible, their own individuality, and by making them under conditions liable for foreign service to add seriousness and increased consideration to the Militia force itself. As regards the territorial Army, we have, as is well known to your Lordships, appointed a Committee to advise us. No one is more conscious than I am of the difficulties and the innumerable criticisms to which this project is, and will be, subjected. I must decline to be rushed into any rash or half-considered expression of opinion. This I hope will be recognised by the House, that we desire to move in this matter upon strictly non-Party lines, and, claiming the co-operation of all Parties, to make no Party capital out of it.

I should like now to say a few words in reply to the points raised by the noble and gallant Earl in his speech. The noble Earl has been, I believe, since its commencement, President of the National Service League. I confess I felt some difficulty, in listening to his speech in discovering what his proposals were, and therefore I hope I shall not be unduly trespassing on the time of your Lordships if I quote a letter which bears the signature of the noble and gallant Earl as President of the National Service League, and is dated February 17th of this year. The noble and gallant Earl wrote—

> As president of the National Service League I am anxious to remove any misconceptions as to the attitude of that body, and to place before the public a definite outline of its policy. The objects of the National Service League are generally :—
>
> "1. To ensure peace and security for the British Empire by organising our land forces in such a manner that we may not only be able to defend successfully any portion of the Empire against attack, but also that the strength of our defensive arrangements may render any attack improbable.
>
> "2. To improve the moral and physical condition of the nation, and thereby to increase its industrial efficiency."

Then the noble and gallant Earl went on to say—

> "With a view to attaining these two objects the League advocates that, subject to certain exemptions to be defined by law, including those necessary to provide for the requirements of the Navy and mercantile marine, every man of sound physique, without distinction of class, shall be legally liable during certain years of his life to be called upon to serve for the defence of the United Kingdom in case of emergency. In order to fit him for this duty he shall be legally obliged to undergo three or four months military training when he arrives at the military age."

Having listened to the speech of the noble and gallant Earl this afternoon, I think it is a fair question to ask whether it is his desire that this compulsory training and liability shall be for the defence of the United Kingdom or for the defence of the Empire at large. He dwelt upon the great land frontiers of our Empire, and it seems to me that it is reasonable and fair to infer from his speech that he meant that we should have for the defence of our Empire a sufficient force to be able to defend that Empire as a first-class military power. The noble and gallant Earl told us that we had been preserved in the past by alliances with other military nations, which we cannot expect or hope to have at the present time. I wish to ask the noble and gallant Earl whether it is his suggestion that there should be compulsory service at a certain age for home defence or for the defence of the Empire. I shall be willing to stand aside if the noble and gallant Earl will answer that Question. [The noble Earl here paused, but Earl Roberts did not rise to reply.] If it is to be only for home defence, I should like to point out that the responsible advisers of the Crown of both parties—Mr. Balfour in his speech about a year ago, and the Secretary of State in a recent speech—have laid down the principle that for home defence we must rely upon our naval supremacy. We are told that we are not to rely, and need not rely, upon defence by a large Army, but must look in cases of raids to the Volunteers.

I have endeavoured to obtain a Return as to what the proposal of the noble and gallant Earl in his letter amounts to. He is not able to tell me whether he means to make these men liable for foreign service or for home service only. I propose to show your Lordships, in the first place, what the cost would be if they were made liable for home defence only, and what the cost would be if they were made liable for foreign service. I have taken the age of twenty as the military age. I find it to be the age of enlistment in the armies of France, Germany, Russia, Italy, and Switzerland. The noble and gallant Earl proposes that every man of sound physique, without distinction of class, shall be legally liable to undergo three or four months military training when he arrives at military age, to be called out in time of national emergency. Now, I think it will be agreed that if these men are to have once and for all only three or four months military training they must be trained by perfectly competent instructors. Assuming that a staff of instructors, say, of warrant officer rank, should be maintained to train these youths, we may take it that five such instructors could train 100 men in each half year; that is to say, 200 men per annum.

I find that, roughly speaking, there are 400,000 youths attaining the age of twenty every year. I deduct 15 per cent. as the proportion of those unfit from various causes for military service, and that gives me a total of net effectives of 340,000. You would, therefore, require a permanent staff of at least 8,500 instructors for this force of 340,000, and if, as I believe would be necessary, you assume them to be of warrant officer rank—the cost of maintaining a warrant officer being about £150 per annum—the total cost of giving these youths their initial training alone amounts to an annual expenditure of £1,275,000. These figures would roughly represent the minimum cost of merely supplying instructors for this initial training. It does not include any of the numerous incidental charges that are inseparable from military training, and, what is more important still, it is doubtful whether this expenditure of one and a quarter million pounds per annum would be very remunerative if the youths so instructed for three or four months undergo no subsequent training during the interval—possibly a long interval—between this initial training and a national emergency demanding their mobilisation.

The noble and gallant Earl speaks of a national emergency, but there is some difficulty in defining what a national emergency is. Was there a national emergency between the Crimean War and the Boer War? And of what value would it have been if, during all that time, these men had merely had three months training and no subsequent training? I can say, as regards the remarks of the noble and gallant Earl on the Cross Benches (Lord Dundonald), that we at the War Office, although not in favour of compulsion, because we do not think it will be necessary, are in complete sympathy with any measure that would tend, not only for military, but for physical purposes, to promote the drilling of youths both in secondary and in elementary schools; but we feel, and it is, perhaps, a wise feeling on our part, that while anxious to help forward this movement, it had better not be interfered with or dictated too much by officials at the War Office.

There is no doubt that, if you once say that men are to be made liable for training for three or four months, you practically admit the principle of conscription, and it becomes a question of detail whether the three or four months are to be in one year, or as in some foreign countries, a graduated system of certain times of training going over several years. We have an interesting estimate which was drawn up by the late Secretary of State for War, Mr. Arnold-Forster, showing the extra cost of conscription. Perhaps I shall not be wearying your Lordships if I quote some of the figures. This is an actuarial statement drawn up when Mr. Arnold-Forster was at the War Office. He estimated that the extra cost to the State, apart from anything else, for conscription would be close upon £26,000,000 a year, and he arrived at it in this way. He estimated that the number of men to be raised each year would be 380,000; that officers and non-commissioned officers would be additional to that number and would be in the proportion of thirty officers and seventy non-commissioned officers to 900 men; that a commissioned officer would cost the State from £450 to £500 a year, and non-commissioned officers about £150; that officers and non-commissioned officers would be paid at Army rates and privates at a shilling a day; that the Militia and Volunteers would cease to exist; that the Regular Army at home would be reduced by about 30,000 all ranks, including reservists, and that it would be necessary to double the regimental pay of the Regular Army except officers. The figure of £25,900,000, which would be the extra cost for conscription, is made up as follows:—Cost of conscript Army of 380,000 men, with proportion of officers and non-commissioned officers, £27,530,000; cost of doubling the regimental pay of regular soldiers, £4,414,000, making a total of £31,944,000. From this was deducted the saving by the abolition of the Militia and Volunteers, £3,807,000; and the saving by the reduction of 30,000 men in the Regular Army, £2,237,000; leaving, as I have said, a net additional annual cost of £25,900,000. His Majesty's Government have not the money, and I do not think it is likely that any Government would submit proposals involving such financial obligations on the taxpayers of this country.

I should like, before leaving this question, to deal with another point which I think is too often lost sight of. Conscription, whether it is for service of a great or limited degree, implies a very serious interference with the private life of the people. I have with considerable trouble obtained, through the efforts of those at the War Office, a very careful analysis of the system which now exists in Germany. I take Germany because all the other Continental Powers which have conscription have more or less modelled it upon the German system. The procedure adopted in Germany to ensure the registration of all adults for military service is briefly as follows. As soon as a child is born in Germany its name is registered with the civil authorities, and if a male its name is placed upon a special list kept by the police. From that time the boy is under the eye of the civil police, and any change of abode must be reported to the police. Liability to military service lasts from the end of the 17th to the end of the 45th year of age, and this service is divided into active military service and Landsturm service. Every person liable to military service is bound to report himself to the civil authorities of the place of his residence, or of his birthplace if he does not live within the Empire, between the 15th of January and the 1st of February of the year in which he completes his twentieth year of age. He is then bound to appear twice a year, if called upon, before the recruiting authorities until a final decision as to his disposal is arrived at. Then, again—and I beg your Lordships to take notice of this—men are not allowed to emigrate between their seventeenth and twenty-fifth years without permission from the recruiting authorities. Clergymen, or those in charge of registers of birth, have to send in to the recruiting authorities before the 15th of January of each year an extract from their register showing the births of the past year, and those are inscribed on the recruiting register as they come of age for military service. On the personal reports, checked by the registers of births, the parish authorities, under the supervision of the Civil President of the Recruiting Circle, draw up the recruiting registers giving all necessary particulars of each man. All the men becoming liable to service in each year are placed upon one roll in alphabetical order, and on the 15th of February these rolls are sent to the Civil President of the Recruiting Circle. From this time the recruiting passes into the hands of the military authorities.

When we talk of conscription I do not think we quite appreciate the strong feeling that would be aroused in this country with its industrial, and to a large extent its nomad, population if we were to alter almost all the habits and the ways of freedom the people have hitherto enjoyed, and submit them, as you would have to do, to a most careful system of police espionage. The noble and gallant Earl has alluded to the great services of our Army. Our Army has a wonderful history and a wonderful past. It has conquered an Empire greater than the Empire of Rome; but every great battle and every great victory has been fought and won upon territories outside the United Kingdom, and our Army is required, not for home defence, but for the defence of our Empire in India and elsewhere.

The views of other parts of the Empire are very decisive upon this question of conscription. Under the Military Defence Act of 1903 members of the military force of Australia are not liable to service outside the territory of the Commonwealth. In the case of Canada and the Cape active service is not restricted to the limits of the Colony, but may be extended outside the limits only for the defence of the Colony. It is therefore perfectly clear that, in all three cases, though a form of compulsory service is recognised, it is by no means compulsory service to defend the Empire generally in whatever part the danger threatens. On the other hand, general compulsory service or conscription, if established in the British Isles, could have for its only object, or indeed its only possible justification, defence of the distant parts of the Empire, such as India. There is therefore, no comparison between the present compulsory system of these colonies and conscription in the United Kingdom as regards the burden thereby put upon the colonist and the citizen at home, respectively.

To sum up the view of the Government, I think I may say that we feel that the average citizen has begun to expect that before any further demands for monetary or personal service are made upon him he should receive some encouragement by way of seeing some return in the shape of efficiency for the £29,000,000 already spent. The first task, therefore, of the Government is to ensure that the armed force of the nation, which is known as the Regular Army, should be brought to the highest pitch of efficiency consistent with reasonable expenditure. Our second task is to give practical effect to the suggestion of the Commission presided over by my noble friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies—that is, to secure those powers of expansion outside the limit of the Regular Forces of the Crown which that Commission considered essential.

To conscription, whether disguised or undisguised, we are absolutely opposed, and we believe that any suspicion in the minds of the people that our measures were leading in that direction would damn them. In conclusion, we do realise the needs of the Empire and especially the need of a territorial Army, and I trust that in due course we may receive general support in arousing local interest in the raising and training of this Volunteer Army, in creating a close and abiding contact between it and the general civic life of the local community, and in developing it so as to make it an integral part of the civic life, drawing strength and vigour from its general surroundings.

After a pause the MARQUESS of LANSDOWNE and VISCOUNT MILNER rose together, but the former gave way.

*VISCOUNT MILNER: My Lords, I venture to apologise for intruding at all in this debate, and especially for intervening between the House and the noble Marquess; but, as certain questions have been asked with regard to the policy of a body of which I am myself a humble member, I may attempt to give such an answer as is possible on the spur of the moment to the conundrums in question.

I am familiar with the policy of brushing aside all representations, however grave, based on the experience of men most competent to speak with regard to our national unpreparedness for war —of brushing them aside by setting up a bogey called conscription, by putting forward fantastic calculations of what conscription would cost, and by appealing to hardened prejudice on the part of a great section of the British people against a policy which is labelled conscription. On behalf of the National Service League, I am not prepared to allow that body to be saddled with the support of conscription without a very much clearer definition of what conscription means than has ever yet been afforded to us. Speaking for myself, if conscription means the acceptance by this country of the principle that it is one of the primary duties of citizenship to take part in the defence of one's country, and that it is a corollary of that primary duty that every man should be trained to take part in that defence effectively, then, however unpopular it may be, I must confess that I accept it. I am a believer, out and out, in the doctrine of a great nation relying for its own defence and the defence of its possessions on its whole manhood, and not on a limited professional class.

But I should not be justified in attempting to saddle the National Service League with any policy going further than that which the average member of that body approves. I may go further in my own private judgment than the whole of that body; but I am content on this occasion to defend the programme which has been put forward by that body and accepted by all its members against the criticisms—not unfriendly, but perhaps insufficiently-considered criticisms—directed against it by the noble Earl. As I understand him, he tried to impale us on the horns of a dilemma. He said—"If you wish to compel men to serve it must be either only in this country or outside this country—if only in this country, then you will not get the men where you require them. If outside this country"—then followed the usual peroration about conscription. The programme of the National Service League, let it be distinctly stated, is that there should be a local national army—a national army obliged to serve for the defence of these islands. And here I should like to deal with a subsidiary point raised by the noble Earl. He asked—"What is a national emergency?" And he may well ask. But I believe it would be for Parliament to decide when a national emergency arises, as Parliament decides to-day when an emergency has arisen which justifies the calling out of the Reserve forces. I do not see that the necessity of providing an authority to declare a national emergency is any argument against constituting a force which is only to be called out when a national emergency arises.

Now let me turn to the question of the limitation of this obligation—the limitation to the defence of these islands. The programme which has received the sanction of the noble and gallant Earl who initiated this debate goes no further than that. There may be some of us who are prepared to go further; but I am speaking for a body, and in some sense for the noble and gallant Earl himself, and I confine myself to the convictions of that body as a whole. But does it follow that because a national territorial army would be under no obligation to serve abroad, the existence of such an army would not provide an invaluable reservoir of men from which there would be no difficulty in drawing a sufficient number of Volunteers to reinforce our Regular forces in the defence of the Empire? What was the experience of the South African War? Was it the experience of an effete country, of a country in which patriotism was dead and in which the people were not willing to come forward in a moment of emergency? Not at all; the difficulty was, not to find men willing to fight, but to find enough men who knew anything about fighting. That is the first great position which we should gain if we had a national territorial army, even if its service in the first instance was limited to this country. We should have a large body of men trained to arms, and an appeal for Volunteers to defend our distant possessions would be addressed to people, not only willing, but competent to respond.

But then it is said that this territorial army will cost a great deal of money. Undoubtedly it will. I am not prepared to discuss at a moment's notice a calculation, involving, it may be, £20,000,000 or £30,000,000, put forward by the noble Earl as the cost of what he calls "conscription." I would rather confine myself to the more modest calculation which he made as to the cost of that which the National Service League does propose—namely, to train for a certain number of months all the youth of the nation of military age. I think the noble Earl came to the conclusion that the number of instructors that would be required would be so great that it would cost something between £1,000,000 and £2,000,000. Well, I am bound to say the figure does not appal me. I am willing to go further and to admit that the programme of the National

Service League would cost more than that, though nothing at all like the fantastic figures given as the cost of "conscription." How much exactly it would cost would require far more careful examination of details than I am in a position to give, nor do I believe anyone has yet attempted to settle the question.

But, my Lords, there are other objections which, I believe, have a greater effect in deterring men from the idea of general military service than its alleged costliness. I should like, if you will permit me, to address myself for a few moments to these objections. I am now speaking not on behalf of any particular body, but I venture humbly to put forward some personal opinions—opinions which, I believe, are obtaining a considerable amount of popular support throughout the country. The view I would venture to maintain is this—that if you go so far as the noble Earl has gone, so far as the Government apparently are prepared to go, in recognising the necessity of the military training of the nation, you will be driven in the last resort to extend that training not only to such individuals as may choose to undertake it, but to the whole body of the people. There are many reasons why I believe that that system is the only one which will give you the desired result. I will only trespass on your Lordships' time by putting forward a very few considerations. I think that system is to be commended on the ground of its greater fairness, on the ground that it alone will ensure an adequate seriousness in your dealings with the territorial army. So long as its numbers are left to chance there will always be a tendency in the future, as there has been in the past, to treat it as a side issue and a subordinate thing—in a manner in which it never can be treated if it includes the whole youth of the nation. I believe, moreover, that a smaller amount of interference with the industry of the country is involved if the obligation of training is universal, and if, therefore, all industrial arrangements are made from the first with a view to it, than if it is spasmodic, irregular, and uncertain. I do not think you can altogether blame the employer for the objection he feels to his men being taken away from him under present conditions. He starts his industry without knowledge of any obligation resting upon all citizens to undergo a certain military training; and the demands which may be made upon him in respect of the training of an uncertain number of Volunteers are quite incalculable.

I do not think it is fair to handicap Volunteering as it is handicapped under present conditions. As long as the defence of the country is left only to those who are willing in the first instance to undertake it, it seems to me that the whole force of our social organisation, of our social arrangements, is directed to causing inconvenience and discomfort to the Volunteer and to checking the number of those who undertake to join in the defence of the country. I believe, further, that the voluntary principle overlooks the great moral value of the idea of a general patriotic obligation. As every citizen in this country has a right to have a voice in the control of its destiny, so he is bound on the same principle to be prepared to serve for its protection.

We hear highly-coloured accounts of the dreadful regulations which have to be adopted in other countries, and especially in Germany, to ensure the carrying out of a system of general military training and service. Yet I ask myself whether it might not, after all, be a great advantage if we in this country had more perfect vital statistics, more perfect knowledge of the numbers and whereabouts of our people, of their physical condition, and of all those important facts which a nation which relies on its whole manhood for its defence is obliged to collect. I do not think it is fair to cast a stigma upon all such in themselves desirable statistics and regulations and to brand them all as "police espionage." They are necessary and useful for other purposes besides ensuring that men should come up to serve when their time for service arrives. If a system which is adopted by every other great European nation and by the one nation of Asia which has attained a great position as a world Power, which was adopted by our own ancestors and by all the free nations of antiquity, is to be regarded as a system unworthy of a free people, I would ask myself how does it come about that none of the great nations of Europe which have adopted it shows any serious signs whatever of departing from it? I believe the prevalence of this system is not merely due to its importance to the military strength of a nation, but also to a consciousness of its value as a means of physical and moral education. I know there is nothing more unpopular with regard to proposals for general military service than the example of Germany. I am aware that in that country the military system is carried to a point and is enforced in a manner which would never be tolerated—and I am glad to think it never would be tolerated—in this country. But it seems to me an entire fallacy to suppose that because we adopt the same principle, the same national idea which is adopted by all other European nations, which has inspired the greatest nations in the world's history at their greatest periods, therefore we are obliged to follow in all its details any particular foreign system. Naturally we should work out the principle according to our own national genius and according to our own special requirements. Therefore it does not seem to me that the objections to national military service as it exists in Germany are in any way an argument against the adoption, I do not say of exactly the same system, but of a similar principle, in England; and even with all its defects I venture to think that the German people are largely indebted, not only for their military power, but for their commercial and industrial progress and greatness, to their military system, and that under no conceivable circumstances will they depart from the principle underlying it.

When we are considering the cost of such a system, do not let us forget that there are many ways of wasting money upon military preparations—waste to which a nation that has some uneasiness about its own military weakness is particularly liable. There is the waste of money involved in constant changes, in foolish spasmodic expenditure, often followed by equally spasmodic and foolish retrenchment. If you add together all the losses in which this country has been involved by continually changing its military system, by its continual unpreparedness for war, losses which perhaps quadrupled and quintupled the cost of the last war in which we were engaged, I think it may be doubted whether a system of universal military training, however costly, would not, if only from the sense of security it would give us, make up for the sacrifices it would entail.

I am sure of this, that there is one form of military expenditure which in any case is not lost. I mean expenditure in developing the manhood of the nation. You get it back in vastly improved physique—one of the most serious problems, I believe, which faces this nation at the present moment—in the development of certain qualities of discipline, order, method, precision, punctuality, and, above all, in a great development of public spirit. The money which is spent in the physical and moral development of your men you get back in peace as well as in war. At the risk of wearying your Lordships, I would in conclusion quote, from among the mass of quotations I could bring forward from competent and trained observers, what has been said with regard to the effect of the German military system, with all its faults, upon the progress of modern Germany by a very able and careful inquirer, and one who is especially distinguished by the total absence of any of that bias, which so often attaches to sociological experts, against their own country. The following is a passage from a book on "Industrial Efficiency" by Dr. Shadwell—

> "Under the German military system the liability comes just when a lad has learned his trade and undoubtedly forms a break in his civil career, but I have not met with two opinions about its educational value to the individual and its industrial value to the nation. Perhaps the most striking fact is the physical benefit derived from the exercises, the drill, gymnastics, and a regular life. It turns a weedy anæmic lad into a well-knit upstanding man, with sound organs and well-developed limbs. It further teaches him cleanliness, discipline, order, authority, self-respect, and respect for others. The effect in the workshop is visible at every turn. It is not too much to say that military service has been in a great measure the making of industrial Germany."

That is the opinion of many men who have studied carefully the effect of the military system of Continental nations, not so much from the point of view of their military strength as from that of their social organisation and industrial efficiency. For my own part I venture, however paradoxical it may seem, to express the conviction that the nations who, like the Germans, adhere to the principle of universal military training are perfectly right, and that in the long-run the peoples who are prepared to undergo the toil and face the danger of personal service will outstrip, not only in war, but also in the competitions of peace, the peoples who shrink from it.

LORD LOVAT: My Lords, I would like to ask the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War a Question with regard to what Lord Milner described as a fantastic calculation. I am quite unable to follow the noble Earl in the calculation he made on the question of the expense of training, and——

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: The figures I quoted in regard to conscription are from a Return drawn up in 1904, which had the signature of the late Secretary of State, Mr. Arnold-Forster.

LORD LOVAT: I should like to ask the noble Earl whether there is any company in any regiment which has five warrant officers for the training. I am aware that in no branch of the Auxiliary Forces is there a company which possesses five warrant officers for training. I am not in favour of compulsory service; I am a firm believer in the voluntary system, but am unable to agree with the estimate which has been given by the Under-Secretary. The noble Earl stated that there were 400,000 youths attaining the age of twenty every year who would be available. I think that is slightly overstating the case. Again, he has calculated that the inefficients who would have to be deducted would number 15 per cent., but this is not borne out by the experience of the Regular Army, where the rejections are 32 per cent. In the Swiss Army the rejections for inefficiency on physical grounds is something like 50 per cent. If three or four months training is given, surely the warrant officers who would be engaged as instructors would be able to conduct two trainings in the same year? As I have stated, I have not risen in the interests of compulsory service, because I am a firm believer in the voluntary system, but simply in the interests of accuracy.

LORD GRIMTHORPE: My Lords, everything that falls from the noble and gallant Earl who initiated this debate on military matters must, of course, receive the careful and respectful attention, not only of this House, but of the country. I cannot help feeling, however, that this debate would have been more interesting as well as more valuable if it had followed instead of preceded the statement which is to be made in the other House two days hence by the Secretary of State for War. We all listened with the greatest care and attention to the noble and gallant Earl, and it seemed to me that in putting forward his arguments he rather shrank from stating in clear language the conclusion to which they obviously led. Lord Milner did not so shrink. Though at first he repudiated the ascription to him of the advocacy of conscription, his whole speech was one continued advocacy of that system. He said it had never been properly defined, but, at all events, he showed clearly enough that he meant by conscription compulsory military service of one kind or another. I think that is what is meant by all advocates of conscription, though they shrink from putting it into clear language. The nation understands by conscription compulsory military service, and personally I think it is evident that the nation does not intend to submit to compulsory service at present.

The noble and gallant Earl who initiated this discussion fell back upon a most extraordinary paradox—namely, that our predominance at sea was due to our military successes on the Continent. I listened to hear how he would make that out, and I think he entirely failed to establish the statement. The downfall of Holland was due to the fact that it was attacked over its land frontier by overwhelming forces and had no means of resistance. An attack on the far-away Indian frontier need not lead to the downfall of England in the same way as that attack led to the downfall of Holland.

With regard to conscription, what case has been made out by the noble and gallant Earl, or anybody else, for increasing the armed forces of the Crown? The noble and gallant Earl contends that our armed forces are no more prepared for war now than they were in 1899. By "armed forces" we are to understand that the noble and gallant Earl means the Auxiliary forces. But surely, when we are discussing whether the nation is properly prepared for war, we cannot possibly leave out of consideration altogether the question of the efficiency of the Regular Army. If the Regular Army is thoroughly efficient—and I did not gather from the noble and gallant Earl whether he thought it was or not—then the nation cannot be said to be in a state of unpreparedness for war. Again, how will the Auxiliary forces be affected by conscription? Is conscription wanted for home defence or for service abroad? General Kelly-Kenny has said—

> "We must have a voluntary army for our work in India and the Colonies, and we should also have a conscript army; but I doubt very much whether with conscription we should ever be able to keep troops for three years in South Africa or in Afghanistan."

It is difficult to argue this question until we know what this Army recruited by compulsory service is to do. Lord Milner stated that it was to be recruited first of all for service at home, and that it would undoubtedly volunteer for service abroad in case of need. Therefore it is evident that the noble Viscount wishes to employ our conscript army for service abroad in the long run.

VISCOUNT MILNER: Yes, in case of emergency.

LORD GRIMTHORPE: Is it necessary to alter our whole military system in order that we may get volunteers in cases of emergency for service abroad? Can we not rely on getting sufficient volunteers for service abroad when necessary under our existing system? There were 124 battalions of Militia at the time of the Boer war, and of those only four—three Irish battalions and one Scottish—did not volunteer for service abroad. I think the record of the Militia is about as satisfactory as it could be. We also got a large number of volunteers from the Yeomanry and the Volunteer forces. These volunteers were sufficient to carry us through the most serious emergency which has arisen since the Napoleonic wars. The evidence before the Commissions shows that it was largely due to the assistance which the Regular Army received from volunteers that the Boer war was successfully carried to a conclusion. Under our present system we obtained all the aid we required. If we had needed more aid we would have received it. Why, then, upset the whole of our military system to fasten on the necks of the people of this country compulsory service to which they are profoundly opposed, when you thereby get no superior result in time of emergency than you are able to secure under our present system?

A stronger case must be made out in favour of conscription before the country will agree to it. Lord Milner contemplated two armies, and the quotation which has been read from General Kelly-Kenny shows that it is admitted we must have a voluntary army for service in the Colonies and India. If we go to the nation and say that every man is to be compelled to serve in some military capacity, where are we going to get a voluntary army? The working men would then say, "We have done our duty by our country, and you cannot call upon us any more." The voluntary army would then be depleted just in the same manner as the introduction of enlistment for three years depleted your long service men. When enlistment for three years was proposed nearly all the recruits chose three years, and we were face to face with a great difficulty in India owing to the lack of long service men to fill up drafts. If this country offered an easier alternative it is certain that that alternative would be embraced, and we should not get a voluntary army in sufficient numbers to serve abroad.

It seems to me that in all these military questions the balance must be struck between three elements—our requirements, the number of men available, and the money that the country is able to spend. Of these the only constant is the number of men. Whatever system is established—and, Heaven knows! there have been many systems tried and many schemes put into operation which have had abortive results—the number of recruits upon which we can rely is from

35,000 to 40,000 a year. In any system of Army reform we must build up from these recruits, and the reason that so many schemes have failed is that it has been assumed that the recruits will come in as they are wanted. Experience has shown that they do not come in as they are wanted. There is also the question of money. Noble Lords on the other side have practically ignored the question of money. The expansionists always quote the returns of our growing trade, our increasing incomes, and our larger assessments for property tax. Therein they find themselves in singular collision at times with the Tariff Reformers. How they intend to reconcile their figures as to the prosperity of the country with each other will remain to be seen. But for the moment the expansionists seek to make out that the country is in a state of overwhelming prosperity and can afford to spend more money on the Army. They ignore the Navy. They ignore the fact that our Navy is now up to the three-Power standard, and the fact that for home defence a large Army is not required. They ignore the economic situation. They ignore the fact that during the last six years our gross liabilities have increased by £200,000,000, and that our expenditure has increased by £40,000,000 a year. They ignore also the political situation. Owing to the wise and statesmanlike policy of the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, which has borne such admirable fruit all over the world, the political situation is not what it was ten years ago, and must be taken into consideration when you are asking for large sums of money for the Army. The Navy is ignored, the economic situation is ignored, and the political situation is ignored, and, having ignored these three things, it is said that because the income-tax is expanding we can spend more money on the Army. But I ask noble Lords who favour an increase of the Army whether they are also in favour of an increased income-tax. If the scheme of the National Service League is to be carried out it will mean an income-tax of 1s. 6d. in the £, and under any scheme of conscription the income-tax would have to be screwed up to 2s. in the £. That is what conscription means; and even admitting, as I do admit, a great deal of what Lord Milner said as to the effect it would have on the physique of the nation, I contend that a case has not been made out for largely extending the Army and certainly not for introducing compulsory service into this country. Lord Milner said the nations abroad were still satisfied with their system of compulsory service. I must say that I think close observers of what is taking place on the Continent at this moment have not come to that conclusion. In France they have reduced their term of military service to two years. Germany would like to do the same. The forces that are growing on the Continent are not the forces that make for war, but the forces that make for peace; and, despite the statements of sensation mongers, I venture to say there never was a time when nation was less inclined to rise against nation and when nations were more disposed to enter into friendly relations one with another.

The curse of war and its losses have been brought home to all nations, and they are less inclined than ever to give of their youth and strength and money to the exacting demands of universal military service. That being so, I do not think that this, at all events, is the time for us to alter our voluntary military system, a system under which we have achieved all the objects upon which we have set our hearts. In this House it is, perhaps, unpopular to resist any increase in the Army. It is too often assumed that those who advocate such an increase are animated by more sincere patriotism than we who resist it. I do not think that can be maintained for one moment. There is no monopoly of patriotism. It is not less patriotic on our part to resist the piling up of a huge military budget than it is on your part to advocate a scheme which would lead to the depletion of the national resources. I think that before the noble and gallant Earl can convince the country that more money is needed for military purposes he will have to make out a better case.

As to the Auxiliary Forces, I was delighted to hear from the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War that it is proposed to establish a large territorial army. Mr. Arnold-Forster wanted to merge the Militia into the territorial army. He had an extraordinary dislike of the Militia and wished to abolish it, but, fortunately, the country was not of his opinion. Surely the disadvantages the Militia have had to contend with must be well known. Hitherto, the Militia, like Tony Lumpkin, have been "snubbed in spirits and snubbed out of spirits." They have been depreciated, they have been condemned, they have been deprived of their best officers, and skimmed for the benefit of the Regular Army. They have been subjected to such treatment that it is a wonder they exist in their present state of efficiency. If the Militia are treated well they will form a territorial army sufficient for all purposes of defence. If you enlist local patriotism on behalf of it, your local army will grow, and the number of men forthcoming will be sufficient to discharge all the purposes the conscriptionists have in view. The noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State has made a satisfactory statement on that point, and I think those who believe in entrusting the defence of these shores to citizens who give their services voluntarily will be abundantly justified by the results of the policy of His Majesty's Government.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I rose in my place a few moments ago only because, as far as I was able to see, the debate was on the point of collapsing, and because it seemed to me hardly respectful to your Lordships that it should close without a few words from this Bench showing how deeply we appreciate the gravity of the question which has been raised by the noble and gallant Earl on the Cross Benches. I listened with attention to the speech of the Under-Secretary of State for War and it seemed to me that the most conclusive passages in it were those in which he put in a very reasonable plea to be excused from entering into details with regard to the intentions of His Majesty's Government. An important statement dealing with Army organisation is to be made shortly, and I therefore think the noble Earl is justified in suggesting that any discussion of these questions would meanwhile be carried on at a considerable disadvantage. The rest of the noble Earl's statement was directed to a dissertation on conscription and to a somewhat vague and rather exuberantly worded sketch of the treatment which the Auxiliary Forces might expect at the hands of his Majesty's Government.

As to the question of conscription, I should like to remind the House that the word was not mentioned in the notice of the noble and gallant Earl, which is the subject of debate, nor in the speech which he delivered to the House, nor did the report of the Elgin Commission on which the noble Earl rested his case, contain any reference to the question of conscription. I agree with the noble Viscount who spoke with so much effect just now, that we are apt to brand too hastily as schemes of conscription all schemes which contain any trace or vestige of compulsion. Let me illustrate my meaning. We now require the youth of this country to learn certain things when at school. We might project our minds into a future when the education of an English boy would not be considered complete unless he had had some instruction in the use of the rifle. Well, my Lords, a proposition of that kind would stop very far short of what we generally speak of as conscription.

Although I am not always able to agree with the whole of the proposals put forward by the noble and gallant Earl in regard to resort to compulsion, I think he was justified in bringing this matter again before the House. He seems to me this evening to have taken up a position which it is not easy to assail. In the first place, the noble and gallant Earl tells you that history shows that neither this nation nor any other nation in the past has been able to rely for its safety on the possession of a navy alone. That is a view which I believe is shared by every Member of the House. Certainly the Government of which I had the honour of being a member, never for a moment admitted that the strength of our Navy afforded any justification for the neglect of the land forces of the Crown, and all the naval schemes of defence for which we were responsible postulated the existence of a sufficient land force.

The next proposition of the noble Earl is that we should look outside the Regular Forces for those reinforcements which in a case of great national emergency we should unquestionably need. On that point I am entirely in accord with the views expressed by the Royal Commission presided over by the noble Earl opposite. Our experience during the South African War demonstrated the truth of that proposition. It was a war which we undertook under the impression that the forces upon which we could already count would be amply sufficient for our purpose. But our experience taught us in a very short time that we had to go outside the limits of those forces; and the result was that we were obliged to take men who were absolutely without any military training and who went out to South Africa without any knowledge of drill, discipline, or of the use of the rifle. The noble and gallant Earl very properly desires that we should profit by this lesson, and that we should do something to train the youths of this country in such a manner as to supply them with some knowledge of these things. The only other proposition to which, I think, the noble Earl committed himself was the great importance of a reserve of officers. Personally I have never discussed these questions with any military authority without finding that this question of the dearth of officers is one of the most formidable difficulties which military reformers have to consider.

There was one point, and one point only, I think, on which I could bring myself to disagree with what fell from the noble and gallant Earl this evening. He dwelt upon the indifference of the nation to these questions. I doubt extremely whether the nation is indifferent to them. If I may say so, I believe that the nation is not indifferent, but puzzled. The nation has been treated to one scheme after another of Army reform, it has been inundated with Reports of Committees and Royal Commissions, and it has really begun to regard these questions with feelings of despair rather than of indifference. It only awaits the discovery of the one great, final, successful measure which is to overcome the difficulties that have been fatal to so many. The present Secretary of State for War has commenced his career of office with a great feeling of public confidence behind him; and I am sure that I may say for my friends who sit near me that we are all ready to give his proposals, which we look forward to seeing very shortly, our most dispassionate and certainly not unfriendly consideration. In the mean while, I think the House should be grateful to the noble and gallant Earl for having once again impressed upon us, in eloquent language, what is certainly a great national duty.

*THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, as I listened to the speech of my noble and gallant friend on the Cross Benches there came to my mind the recollection of the day on which the late Prime Minister made a very interesting statement of military policy in the other House of Parliament. That recollection has stayed with me throughout the debate, because no word fell from my noble and gallant friend to show that he had any belief in the doctrine which was laid down by Mr. Balfour and which goes by the name of the "Blue Water" theory.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I beg to protest against that statement. Mr. Balfour never committed himself to what is commonly known as the "Blue Water" theory.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I do not think my noble friend will deny that Mr. Balfour said this country was defended by the Navy to an extent which would render it secure from a great and serious invasion.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Throughout his argument Mr. Balfour postulated the existence of a very large force maintained for the purpose of securing the country from attack.

*THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: The theory that the Navy, if it be a sufficient Navy, can afford us security against serious invasion—I am not speaking of raids—has been the theory upon which for the last twelve months or more the various schemes of Army reform have been founded; and, for my part, I am prepared to accept that theory to this extent, that I believe, in spite of what has been said by some very extreme advocates of that theory, that raids are possible and ought to be provided against by the provision of a sufficient military force for the purpose of the defence of this country alone.

My noble and gallant friend also attacked another doctrine which I thought had been established by the epoch-making writings of Captain Mahan, that the possession of sea power was the most solid basis upon which general political and military power could rest. That did not appear to me to be at all accepted by my noble and gallant friend in the description he gave of past history. One of the most remarkable things in a book by this author was an illuminating description of the real secret of our ultimate overthrow of the power of Napoleon. It was in our Navy; and agreeing in the doctrine that the first defence of this country against invasion —and a perfectly secure defence if we have a sufficient Navy—is to be found in the Navy, I take, I confess, a different view from that which has been taken by many in this debate in regard to the position in which we stand at the present time.

His Majesty's Government, as the noble Marquess opposite has very justly admitted, are hampered in this discussion, because on Thursday next my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War intends to make what I am sure will be a very important declaration of policy. I am not, therefore, able to enter into any detail with regard to the scheme which the Government propose for the purpose of meeting the deficiencies of our military system, or to follow the noble and gallant Earl into all the points raised. If it should be desired by noble Lords, after Mr. Haldane's statement has been made, that this question should be again discussed, no objection will be raised by His Majesty's Government. My noble friend who has just sat down seemed to take exception to the introduction of the question of conscription into this discussion. I think my noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for War was entitled to make the remarks he did upon that subject, because, though the noble and gallant Earl did not say a word either in his notice or in his speech upon conscription so called, he did propose that there should be compulsory training for every youth in this country after a certain age.

But the moment you begin to insist upon compulsion you will inevitably end in conscription. No one could have listened to the earnest speech of the noble Viscount on the Cross Benches and not have seen that he, a strong, honest advocate for conscription, was looking to that as the ultimate point at which he desired to arrive. I venture to say, my Lords, that if once we embark on a system of compulsion in any part of our military system a step will be taken upon an inclined plane which will finally lead to military conscription. The noble Viscount asked, "Why is it that you object so greatly to the system which exists in other countries? Why is it that, while all the great military Powers of the world have conscription in some form or another, you alone reject it?" The noble Viscount and others forget the existence of what is called the "Silver Streak." This is an island. Though we are undoubtedly a great military Power we have no land frontiers to guard in this country, and thus we are able, with perfect safety, as I believe, to refuse to follow in the footsteps of foreign countries in this matter, and to refuse to introduce the German system to which the noble Viscount alluded, and which is objectionable, not merely because it forces men to undergo military service whether they like it or not, but also because it is, and must necessarily be, based on a system of police, which I hold would never be endured in this country. This is the ground upon which I venture to enter my protest against any system of conscription. In this matter the true motto for us is *Principiis obsta.* Let us not take any step which will lead in this direction. I cannot agree with the views of the noble Viscount as to the moral aspect of conscription; and when he tells us to look at Germany and to attribute its industrial prosperity to a system of compulsion, I reply that England has a free system, and to that system I attribute the industrial prosperity of England.

MOTOR CAR COMMISSION.

THE EARL OF POWIS: My Lords, on behalf of my noble friend, Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government when the Report of the Royal Commission on Motor Cars may be expected.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: I am informed by Lord Selby that the Report of the Commission, which has had forty sittings and examined 120 witnesses, will probably be presented in the course of the next fortnight. It is the intention of His Majesty's Government to continue the present Act—the Motor Car Act, 1903—in force for another twelve months by the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill.

House adjourned at twenty minutes past Seven o'clock, to Thursday next, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 10*th July*, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

WORCESTER ELECTION.

King's Answer to Address reported, as follows:—

"I have received the Joint Address of the two Houses of Parliament in reference to the Report made by the Judges selected to try a Petition in respect of the Election and Return for the City of Worcester.

"And I have given directions accordingly for the appointments of the Gentlemen named in the Address to be Commissioners for the purpose of making the inquiry prayed for."

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Midland Railway Bill; Uxbridge Gas Bill. Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Newport Corporation Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered. An Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords]. To be read a second time To-morrow.

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill. "To confirm a Provisional Order under The Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, relating to Paisley Gas and Water," presented by Mr. Sinclair.

Ordered, That Standing Order 193a be suspended and the Bill be read the first time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the first time, and (under Sections 9 and 16 of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) ordered to be read a second time upon Wednesday, July 18th, and to be printed. [Bill 304.]

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).

MR. BONAR LAW reported from the Committee on Group J. of Private Bills; That the parties opposing the Local Government Board Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill had stated that the evidence of Robert Sydney Marsden was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said Robert Sydney Marsden do attend the said Committee To-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Robert Sydney Marsden do attend the Committee on Group J of Private Bills to-morrow, at half-past eleven of the clock.

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill [Lords] (by Order); South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords] (by Order). Read a second time, and committed.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill; Cardiff Railway Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—London and South Western Railway Bill; Manchester Corporation Bill; Cheltenham Gas Bill; Metropolitan Water Board Bill; Peterborough Gas Bill; North East London Railway Bill; Huddersfield Corporation Bill; Cardiff Gas Bill; London County Buildings Bill, with Amendments.

Amendments to Manchester Churches Bill [Lords]; Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; from Bawtry with Austerfield; Bristol; Burton-upon-Trent; Crediton; Hickling; and Lincoln; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petitions against alteration of Law; from Arlington; Godmanchester; Platt; and Trowell; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petition from Long Sutton, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN TRAWLERS (REGULATION) BILL.

Petition from Royal Burghs of Scotland, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION, ETC., (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petitions for alteration; Aberdare (two); Banffshire; and Keith; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Long Compton, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ORDNANCE SURVEY.

Copy presented, of Report of the Progress of the Ordnance Survey to March 31st, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Colonial Report No. 487 (Weihaiwei, Report for 1905) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STRIKES AND LOCK-OUTS.

Copy presented, of Report on Strikes and Lock-outs of 1905, and on Conciliation and Arbitration Boards [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SPAIN (NEW CUSTOMS TARIFF).

Copy presented, of Translation of the New Customs Tariff of Spain, with Comparison of the Duties leviable under the Tariff in force prior to July 1st, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.

Account presented, of Deposits in Naval Savings Banks, and the payments thereof, and the interest thereon, &c., during the financial year 1904–5 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 246.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3664 and 3665 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

REVENUE (COLLECTION OF TAXES).

Return ordered, "showing for each of the three Kingdoms (1) the amount charged for Income Tax, Land Tax, and Inhabited House Duty for the financial years 1904, 1905, and 1906; and (2) the amounts and percentage of same collected in each country by the 31st day of January and the 28th day of February respectively in each of the said years (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No 104, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. McCrae.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Post Office Telegraphists and Volunteer Corps.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness): To ask the Postmaster-General if any orders have been recently issued with reference to the employees of the post office joining the Volunteer forces or attending camp; and if any order has been made applying to telegraphists in any way different to those applying to other employees of the post office.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Answer is in the negative.

Returns Relating to Administrative Boards in Ireland.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant the Return relating to Administrative Boards in Ireland standing on to-day's Notice Paper in the name of the hon. Member for West Kerry.†

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am considering the question whether some such Return as the hon. Member desires can be granted, though it could not in any case be the precise Return which he has put on the Paper. I would ask him to defer his Motion for a time.

Convicts as Servants to Private Employers.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the despatch issued by Lord Carnarvon in 1874 [Cd. 1121], in which he condemned the assignation of convicts as servants to private employers or to companies, is still recognised by the Colonial Office; and, if so, what action is being taken to enforce its provisions in South Africa.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Lord Carnarvon's despatch was addressed to the Governor of a Crown Colony. The system of convict and prison labour which prevails in the Cape Colony and in Natal is a matter properly within the control of the Parliaments of those Colonies and of the Ministers responsible thereto.

Board of Education Library.

MR. THOMASSON (Leicester): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether in view of the current controversy upon education and the complexity of the whole subject, he will arrange for a printed catalogue of the library of the Board of Education at St. Stephen's House to be prepared and made available at the earliest possible time for the use of the general public.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Board of Education have already prepared a comprehensive list of books and pamphlets bearing on the difficulties connected with the organisation of religious instruction in connection with elementary schools in this and other countries of the world, but I regret that pressure in the printing offices has delayed the issue of this list, which would, I had hoped, have been useful in connection with discussions on the Bill. As regards a general catalogue of the library, the Question raises many considerable difficulties. The original education library, when it was transferred to St. Stephen's House from South

---

† Administrative Boards (Ireland). Return setting out the various Boards which control Irish government, giving the members of each Board; the duties they have to perform; the annual amount of public funds administered by each; the total number of meetings of each Board held last year, with attendances of each member; the total amount of salaries, expenses, and other allowances paid to the officials in each Board; the annual expenses and allowances, etc., paid to the members of each Board; the direct control exercised by Parliament over each Board.

Kensington some years ago, showed considerable deficiencies in many important departments of educational study; indeed, it was in the highest degree incomplete, and had not been kept up to date. These defects are gradually being made good, and the library now, though not complete, may be considered a fairly comprehensive one in certain departments, at all events, of educational literature During the period of the library's location at St. Stephen's House the card catalogue now in use has been constructed; but this is simply an author catalogue, and it was impossible to make it otherwise. It contains about 36,000 entries, and if printed would fill a volume, royal quarto in size, of at least 1,500 pages. I think so huge a list of unclassified books would be of little value to researchers and students of education. Only a subject catalogue would meet their needs. The preparation of such a catalogue is engaging the attention of the officers of the library, but it is a piece of work which cannot be accomplished within a short space of time; indeed, the period must be measured by years rather than by months. A catalogue of this nature can only be satisfactorily constructed with the help of a specially qualified staff, when the books themselves have been arranged on the shelves on a subject basis. It would not be possible to carry out this rearrangement of the books in the present temporary and most imperfect quarters in Canon Row; but the new classification has already been applied experimentally to the inspector's lending library, and it is hoped that the experience thus gained will enable the Board to extend the system to the reference library, and to proceed in course of time to the preparation of an efficient subject catalogue of these books when the removal to the new building has been effected.

Children over Fourteen Attending State-Aided Schools.

MR. MASSIE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education the number of children over fourteen years of age in England and Wales who are attending the day schools aided from the Parliamentary grant; and the proportion per 1,000 which those scholars bear to the total number of scholars attending those schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The figures for the year 1903–4 are as follows. Later figures are not available.

Number of children over 14 years of age on the registers of public elementary schools -	60,056
Number of children over 14 years of age on the registers of higher elementary schools -	2,123
Number of children over 14 years of age on the registers of special schools - - -	2,140
Total - - -	64,319

Proportion per 1,000 which the number of these children bears to the total number of children attending the schools mentioned equals 10·6.

Schools with Extended Facilities—Representatives of Parents.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall): To ask the President of the Board of Education if the managers of a school to which extended facilities are given will comprise any representatives of the parents who have asked for those facilities?

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In schools carried on as schools provided by a local education authority the managers will be appointed by the public authorities, and it is impossible to make any general statement as to what may be the constitution of such bodies of managers.

Education Bill—Clause 4—Expenses of Public Inquiry.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can state by whom the expenses incurred in connection with a public local inquiry under Clause 4 of the Education Bill now before Parliament are to be defrayed; and whether, if these are to be defrayed by the local education authority, the Board of Education will secure, in the regulations relating to such inquiries to be made by them under Clause 13 (3) of the Bill, that the local education authority shall be protected against having to hold a second inquiry in the case of a particular school within, say, a year, if the result of the ballot has established that the statutory four-fifths majority in favour of special religious instruction does not exist, and generally against having to hold frivolous and unnecessary inquiries?

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The expenses in question will be defrayed by the local education authority. I will give careful consideration to the point referred to in the last part of the Question.

Teachers' Superannuation Fund.

MR. ARMITAGE (Leeds, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he will state the amount of money standing to the credit of teachers in the Superannuation Fund on December 31st, 1905, and March 31st, 1906, also, the number of teachers, male and female, paying into it?

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The amount standing to the credit of teachers in the Deferred Annuity Fund on the dates mentioned is as follows:—

December 31st, 1905.

	£	s.	d.
Male teachers - -	508,526	19	9
Female teachers - -	506,801	16	10
Total -	1,015,335	16	7

March 31st, 1906.

	£	s.	d.
Male teachers - -	539,717	9	5
Female teachers- -	543,397	3	10
Total -	1,083,114	13	3

Owing to the fact that the Board is not always kept informed of deaths, withdrawals from service, or other facts bearing on the continuous employment of teachers, it is impossible to say without a prolonged and laborious investigation which is the precise number of teachers who are actually contributing at any given time. But it may be stated that the number is roughly 90,000, of whom about 32,000 are men and about 58,000 are women. I may add that, when the actuarial inquiry into the fund which is now in progress is concluded, information as to the actual number of teachers contributing on March 31st, 1906, will be available.

Children over Fourteen Attending State-Aided Schools in Scotland.

MR. MASSIE: To ask the Secretary for Scotland the number of children over fourteen years of age in Scotland who are attending the day schools aided from the Parliamentary Grant; and the proportion per 1,000 which those scholars bear to the total number of scholars attending those schools?

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The number of children over fourteen years of age on the school registers for the statistical year 1904–5 was 22,815. This gives a proportion to the total number of 28·37 per 1,000.

Children's Courts.

MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when he proposes to introduce his Bill to deal with the subject of the treatment of children in courts of summary jurisdiction; and whether the Bill will provide for separate treatment as well as for separate officers?

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I presume that my hon. friend refers to the Bill for the appointment of probation officers and the release of youthful and other offenders on probation, which is now in draft. The Bill presents several difficult questions; but good progress has been made with it, and I hope to be in a position to introduce it shortly. With regard to the separate treatment of children's cases, the information which I have already given shows clearly how much can be done under the existing law; and I think it will be well to wait for further experience of the effect of recent Home Office action before considering whether further legislation would be useful.

Vaccination Exemption Certificates—Case of Mr. W. C. Palmer, of Merridge.

MR. MONTGOMERY (Somersetshire, Bridgwater): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that Mr. W. C. Palmer of Merridge, Spaxton, near Bridgwater, applied on September 29th, 1904, to the Bridgwater county petty sessional magistrates for a certificate of exemption from vaccination of his child, and was refused; that subsequently he was prosecuted for refusing to have his child vaccinated; that the same bench made an order, with 10s. 6d. costs, directing him to have his child vaccinated, and afterwards fined him 20s. and 2s. costs for disobeying that order; that goods to the value of £10 have been seized to be sold in liquidation of the fine and costs which Mr. Palmer refuses to pay on the ground that they were illegally imposed; and whether, under the circumstances, the President of the Local Government Board will countermand such sale.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. I have no information with regard to the facts of the case beyond that furnished by the hon. Member in the Question; but, assuming his statement to be accurate, I may say at once that neither I nor any other Department of the Executive Government have power to interfere with the execution of a warrant of distress issued by a court of competent jurisdiction. It does not appear on what ground the validity of the magistrates' order is disputed, but if any question of law is involved that could only be determined by a Court of Law.

Rainfall in Guzerat and the Deccan.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney N): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state the amount of rainfall in Guzerat and the Deccan since the 1st June; and what is the probable forecast of the monsoon.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) In a telegram of the 9th July the Viceroy reports "general and beneficial rain in Bombay, though insufficient in parts of three affected districts, in two of which sowing operations have been retarded; fodder continues scarce, and cattle not yet improved in condition; drinking water supply improved, but still insufficient in parts; prices continue high; numbers on relief decreasing; employment sufficient." The forecast issued in June last by the Meteorological Department predicts a seasonable rainfall not appreciably smaller in amount than that of the past year.

Children over fourteen attending State-Aided Schools in Ireland.

MR. MASSIE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland the number of children over fourteen years of age in Ireland who are attending the day schools aided from the Parliamentary grant, and the proportion per 1,000 which those scholars bear to the total number of scholars attending those schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the number of children over fourteen years of age who are on the rolls of national schools in Ireland is 47,173 or sixty-four per thousand of the total number on the rolls. The Commissioners' records do not enable them to state the number of children over fourteen who are in average attendance, but the number over fifteen years of age in average attendance is 11,766 or 23·5 per thousand of the total average attendance.

Army Promotions—Outside Influence.

MR. PAUL (Northampton): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is acquainted with the terms of an instruction issued by the Army Council on the 26th of April 1904, and forbidding attempts to obtain favourable consideration of any application by the use of outside influence; and whether he is prepared to enforce that order by treating every breach of it as an admission on the part of the applicant that his case is not good on its merits.

(*Answered by Mr Secretary Haldane.*) I am aware of this order. It has been embodied in the King's Regulations, and the Army Council is determined that it shall be enforced.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Tidworth Barracks.

LORD CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that the barracks at Tidworth are still lit with oil; if it is proposed to introduce electric light, and thereby mitigate the chances of fire;

and will he say whether the barracks at Tidworth are insured against fire risks.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Haldane, Haddington): The introduction of electric lighting instead of oil is entirely a matter of funds; none are available at this moment for this purpose. It is not the practice to insure Army barracks against fire risks.

Norwich Barracks.

Lord CASTLEREAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the barracks at Norwich, the foundations of which were laid early in October, 1905, are yet completed; and, if not, when will they be.

*Mr. HALDANE: As I informed the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, in February last,† barrack policy must be subservient to and dependent on general policy. I am not yet in a position to announce a decision on the question of military policy involved, and so I cannot at present assent to the expenditure of nearly £200,000 which would be involved by the building of new barracks at Norwich.

Lord CASTLEREAGH asked if the Army Council was in favour of the Norwich scheme.

Mr. HALDANE: The Army Council has never expressed an opinion on the subject, but I know the Council very strongly holds the view I have just expressed.

Army Establishment Shortage.

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT: (Marylebone, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can give from actuarial calculation figures as to the automatic shortage which will take place in the establishment of the Regular Army at Home and in India during the next six years.

Mr. HALDANE: The hon. Baronet is presumed to refer to the shortage which may be expected in the strength of the Infantry of the Line. On the assumption that the intake of recruits will not exceed 22,000 annually and that present establishments are maintained, it is probable that two years hence the shortage will be between 12,000 and 14,000. After that date the effective strength would begin to rise as the men enlisted under the three years system pass to the reserve.

Army Chaplain and the Government Education Bill.

Mr. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that in May last, at Tunbridge Wells, a highly partisan sermon attacking the Government's Education Bill was delivered by the chaplain at a camp church parade of the West Kent Imperial Yeomanry; whether attendance at these services is compulsory; and, if so, whether he will take steps to prevent the recurrence of such practices in the future, and will further provide that attendance shall not be demanded from those who are not members of the Established Church.

Mr. HALDANE: The service in question was not a camp church parade, but was held in the parish church. According to the custom in the Army, all men not on leave or specially employed attend, but there is no compulsion to attend in the case of men who do not belong to the denomination concerned. The action of the chaplain is to be regretted, and it is presumed will not be repeated.

Army Pensions.

Mr. PARKER (Halifax): On behalf of the hon. Member for Sunderland, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the number of private soldiers of all ranks, as also non-commissioned officers, that have retired on a pension during the last seven years.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clii., 773.

*MR. HALDANE: Number of non-commissioned officers and men discharged with pensions during the seven years 1899–1900 to 1905–6—

Service Pensions.

Year.	1899-1900	1900-01	1901-02	1902-03	1903-04	1904-05	1905-06.
Non-Com. Officers -	656	372	708	1,256	1,050	1,023	1,204
Corporals and Privates -	379	162	343	768	641	615	1,897

Disability Pensions.

Year.	1899-1900	1900-01	1901-02	1902-03	1903-04	1904-05	1905-06.
Non-Com. Officers -	148	352	530	434	289	269	239
Corporals and Privates -	1,362	4,849	8,484	6,960	3,382	2,665	1,629

Totals during the seven years—

	Service Pensions.	Disability Pensions.	Total number of Pensions.
Non-Com. Officers -	6,269	2,261	8,530
Corporals and Privates -	4,805	29,331	34,136
Total	11,074	31,592	42,666

Under-Age Recruits.

*MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the General Officer commanding the Forces in Ireland will now agree to the discharge of Michael M'Garvey, who enlisted in the Royal Irish Fusiliers, and whose parents applied for his discharge, he being still under eighteen years of age.

MR. HALDANE: Questions of under-age discharges are, under the King's Regulations, dealt with by General Officers Commanding in Chief, with whose discretion I am not prepared to interfere.

*MR. HUGH LAW: Does the right hon. Gentleman think it will encourage recruiting in Ireland to insist upon retaining with the colours boys under age who are the sole support of their parents?

MR. HALDANE: These points can only be decided by those who have the full facts before them.

Education in Ceylon.

SIR C. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what has been the fate of the Ordinance which was submitted by the Governor of Ceylon to the legislature of that Colony some month or two ago, with regard to giving power to municipalities and local boards to provide facilities for elementary vernacular education; and whether the further legislation for requiring planters to provide estate schools for the children of coolies and the inspection of those schools by Government officials has taken solid shape.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The "Town Schools Ordinance" has been passed and has received His Majesty's sanction. A copy will be supplied to the hon. Member, if he desires to have it. I understand that the further legislation referred to is now being drafted.

Indian Railway Administration.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the inconvenience and loss resulting to merchants, shippers, cultivators, and the public generally, by the insufficiency of rolling stock on the main lines of railway in India have been brought to his notice; and whether he will take such steps as may be proper and practicable to bring about an improvement in this behalf.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. JOHN ELLIS, Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): As the Secretary of State stated in reply to a Question on the 29th March,† this matter has been under consideration, and provision has been made for a large outlay upon rolling-stock during the next three years, which I hope will remove the causes of complaint.

Rewards for Killing Tigers and Leopards.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will inquire regarding the indiscriminate offer of rewards by the Government of, and by the local governments in, India for the destruction of tigers and leopards; and whether, seeing that these animals keep down the head of deer and sounder of pig, which destroy the crops of the cultivator, he will consider the propriety of discontinuing to offer such rewards at the cultivator's expense, to the cultivator's detriment.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: The Secretary of State does not consider that the discontinuance of these rewards is advisable. He thinks it is generally felt that any indirect advantage to crops that might result from the multiplication of tigers and leopards would be more than counterbalanced by the increased danger to human beings, cattle and domestic animals.

MR. REES asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that these rewards only operated on the margin of the cultivation where these animals were personally known to the villagers.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: No doubt the Secretary of State is aware of that.

Alleged Hanging of a Reprieved Native in Eastern Bengal.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is in a position to give any explanation of the circumstances under which Udoya Patni, of Sylhet, in Eastern Bengal and Assam, was hanged under the orders of the Lieutenant-Governor, although his prayer for mercy had been transmitted by the Lieutenant-General to the Governor-General in Council, and the orders of the Governor-General, granting a reprieve, arrived after the execution had taken place; and whether he can state what action he has taken, or proposes to take, in the matter.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: The Secretary of State is not in a position to answer any Question on this subject to-day.

SIR H. COTTON: Can the hon. Gentleman give any indication when I may put the Question down again?

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: I am afraid I cannot. I am sure hon. Members who have Questions on this very grave subject will recognise it is absolutely essential that the India Office should be in possession of every fact available. I can assure the House, however, that no time is being lost, and that the Secretary of State will shortly be able to make his promised statement.

Slavery in Morocco.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Sultan of Morocco has taken any steps to carry out the recommendation of the Algeciras Conference that the public sale of slaves should be prohibited in his dominions; and whether he has any official information showing that a young black girl was recently sold in the city of Tangier, and that her father was unable to obtain any redress.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): His Majesty's Government have so far received no information as to the steps taken by the Sultan of Morocco to carry out the recommendations of the Algeciras Conference that the public sale of slaves should be prohibited in his dominions.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliv., 1521.

They are, however, in communication with His Majesty's Minister at Tangier, who has brought the subject to the attention of the Sultan's Government, and has received a reply stating that the Sultan has sent orders to all the authorities of the towns to put a stop to the sale into slavery of children born free. In reply to the second part of the Question, no information has been received of the case of slave dealing mentioned.

*Mr. ASHLEY: Will there be power under the agreement come to at the Algeciras Conference to stop the public sale of slaves in the coast towns?

Sir EDWARD GREY asked for notice of that Question.

Great Britian and Servia—The Regicides.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that of the thirty-two officers and others who took an active part in the assassination of the late King and Queen of Servia, four only have been retired, aad that such four have been retired on full pay, with the special thanks of King Peter; whether he is aware that the resumption of diplomatic relations in these circumstances has caused misgiving in the minds of a section of the Servian community; whether he is aware that it has been officially announced that the British representative, upon his arrival at Belgrade, is to be escorted to the Palace by prominent regicides; and whether, in all these circumstances, he will consider the propriety of delaying the departure of the British representative and the reception of the Servian Minister pending further explanations from Belgrade.

Sir EDWARD GREY: For the first paragraph of this Question, I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer returned by me to his Question in this House on the 28th ultimo,† namely, that the conditions upon which the resumption of Diplomatic relations between His Majesty's Government and the Servian Government was made to depend having been fulfilled, His Majesty's Government are not concerned with other matters. The Answer to the second paragraph is in the negative. In regard to the third paragraph of the Question His Majesty's Government are not aware that any such official announcement has been made, or that any such intention exists, which would obviously be quite contrary to the spirit in which Diplomatic relations have been renewed.

Mr. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): In view of the horror in which this country holds these and other regicides, will the right hon. Baronet consider the advisability of sending the King of Servia a copy of Lord Rosebery's "Life of Oliver Cromwell"?

Metropolitan Police at Race Meetings.

Dr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is now in a position to say by whom the application was made for the services of the Metropolitan Police to keep order at the recent race meeting at Ascot; by whom the request was granted; and how much was charged for the services of the police.

*The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): The police maintaining order at Ascot were applied for by Mr. Clement, the clerk of the course, Lieutenant Colonel Carter, on behalf of the Grand Stand Trustees, the secretaries of the Coaching Club, the Four-in-Hand Club, and the Cavalry Clubs; the Great Western, London and South-Western, and South-Eastern and Chatham Railways. A charge was made for their services at the customary rate for police employed beyond the district. This rate is fixed for each rank at a sum which includes pay, clothing, allowances, and every other item in the cost of a police officer. The total sum was £1,202 11s. 9d.

Dr. COOPER asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that many of the suburbs of London were denuded of police during this meeting?

*Mr. GLADSTONE: No, Sir, I am not at all aware of that.

Mr. MOONEY (Newry): Who is the Master of the Buckhounds who, according to a recent Answer by the right hon Gentleman, defrays a portion of the cost.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix, 1133.

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. COOPER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Metropolitan Police are used to maintain order at the Lingfield or Gatwick race meetings, or at any other race meetings outside the Metropolitan Police area; and whether he will consider the advisabilty of allowing the Metropolitan Police being used outside their district.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: It has been usual for many years for the Metropolitan Police to maintain order at certain race meetings outside the Metropolitan Police area. Those meetings are Ascot, Goodwood, Windsor, and Sandown. Metropolitan Police are not sent for this purpose to Lingfield or Gatwick. A considerable proportion of the spectators at these meetings come from the Metropolitan Police district, and, moreover, the county police cannot always provide the number of men required.

Mr. COOPER asked whether it was the duty of the metropolitan ratepayers to find police to keep order in other counties.

Motor Car Accidents.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state the number of accidents in the London area during the month of June last from motor 'buses and motor cars respectively; in how many instances have personal injuries resulted; and in how many cases have such injuries proved fatal.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: During the month of June the number of accidents known to the police to have been caused by motor cars (including motor cycles) within the Metropolitan Police district was 559. Of these 178 resulted in personal injury and four proved fatal. In the same month 390 accidents were caused by motor omnibuses, of which eighty resulted in personal injury and three proved fatal. These figures do not include accidents caused by tramcars.

Mr. H. H. Cunynghame, C.B.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can give the various Commissions and Committees of inquiry upon which Mr. Henry Hardinge S. Cunynghame, C.B., the Legal Assistant Under-Secretary to the Home Office, has been appointed since his advent to the Department, or, if the information is beyond the limits of an oral Answer, will he give it in a Return; and what special qualifications Mr. Cunynghame possesses to report to the Department on mining and engineering questions.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: Mr. Cunynghame has served with distinction on many Royal Commissions and Committees. Among others he was Chairman of the Committees on the notification of industrial accidents, and the use of electricity in mines. For twelve years all Home Office matters relating to factories and mines have come before him. He has served in the Royal Engineers and is a member of the Institute of Electrical Engineers. His scientific attainments are well known and appreciated by all who know his work.

Chester-le-Street Vaccination Prosecution.

Mr. J. W. TAYLOR (Durham Chester-le Street): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Richard Dixon, of Birtley, was prosecuted under Section 29 of the Vaccination Act of 1867, at Chester-le-Street police court on July 4th, 1906; that the public vaccinator admitted, in evidence, that he had not called to offer vaccination at the home of the child before the cause of complaint arose, viz., before the child attained the age of six months, and that when he did call at the home, after the child had attained the age of seven months, he did so without having previously given twenty-four hours notice of his intended visit, contrary to the provisions of Section 1, Sub-section (3) of the Vaccination Act, 1898; and whether he will remit the fines and costs inflicted at Chester-le-Street petty sessions.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: The Justices convicted the defendant of neglecting to have his child vaccinated within six months of birth without rendering any reasonable excuse for such neglect. They took the view that the notice and visit contemplated by Section 1 (3) of the Vaccination Act, 1898, are not conditions precedent to a conviction. This is a question of law which I have no authority to determine, but I understand the Justices have agreed to state a case for decision of the High Court, and while the matter is thus *sub judice* it would be improper for me to interfere.

Tin and Black-Plate.

Mr. PARKER (Halifax): On behalf of the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Summerbell) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the fact that there are 250,000 persons employed in the manufacture of tin and black-plate; that the manufacture of such articles takes place under unhealthy and dangerous conditions; and, if so, whether it is his intention to afford more inspection to tin-plate works.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: The number of persons employed in the manufacture of black and tin-plate in this country is, I think, very much smaller than that stated in the Question. I am unable to give the exact figures, as in the factory department's tables the industry is included under the heading "Conversion of iron into steel, etc."; but the total number under this heading in 1901 was 138,693, and the black and tin-plate workers would form only a small part. According to the figures of the 1901 census the number employed in the manufacture of tin-plate was just over 15,000. The industry was made the subject of special inquiry in the years 1899 to 1901, and a conference was held with the manufacturers at which certain suggestions for protecting the workers against injurious fumes and dust were discussed. I will call for a special report as to the progress that has been made since then and the present conditions of the industry.

Truck Commission.

Mr. PARKER: On behalf of the hon. Member for Sunderland I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Truck Commission will meet during the autumn session; and when a Report from the Commission may be expected.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: The task imposed on the Committee is a very heavy one, and they will continue their labours during the autumn session. Their work is being pushed on with all expedition, and it is hoped that a Report may be made to me as early as possible next year.

Death Sentences.

Mr. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many sentences of death were passed in Great Britain during the ten years ending 1860, 1870, 1880, 1890, and 1900, respectively; how many of such sentences were duly carried out; how many commuted to terms of imprisonment; and how many were remitted altogether.

*Mr. GLADSTONE: The various figures asked for would take too long to deliver, but if the hon. Member will put down his Question unstarred, I shall be happy to give them in the form of a Table.

Chester-le-Street Vaccination Prosecution.

Mr. J. W. TAYLOR: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that Richard Dixon, of Birtley, was prosecuted under Section 29 of the Vaccination Act, 1867, at Chester-le-Street police court on July 4th, 1906; that the public vaccinator admitted in evidence that he had not called to offer vaccination at the home of the child before the cause of complaint arose (viz., before the child attained the age of six months); that when he did so, after the child had attained the age of seven months, he did so without having previously given twenty-four hours' notice of his intented visit, contrary to the provisions of Section 1, Sub-section (3) of the Vaccination Act, 1898; that the public vaccinator stated in evidence on oath that it was his usual custom to call upon parents to offer to vaccinate their children, without giving the notice provided by statute; that he omitted to send such notice on the advice of the Local Government Board's inspector; and whether he will take steps to ensure the observance of the provisions of the

Vaccination Act, in the Chester-le-Street union, in the above respects.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. John Burns, Battersea): I am aware of the case referred to. I understand that the public vaccinator did not give notice before he visited the home of the child because he had been informed by the father that he would have the child vaccinated by his own doctor, and in the circumstances he did not think notice necessary. The inspector alluded to retired a few years ago, and I have not been able to learn from him what advice he gave as to notices, but the public vaccinator states that in future cases he will endeavour to carry out rigidly the provisions of the Vaccination Acts in this matter.

Milk Trade.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: On behalf of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, having regard to the fact that in the recently issued Report of the Local Government Board for Scotland the Board of Agriculture are stated to have expressed the opinion that milk drawn from a cow within three days after calving is not in a fit condition for sale to the public as milk, and that the sale of any such product as milk renders the seller liable to prosecution under Section 6 of the sale of Food and Drugs Acts, will he state what steps have been taken to make this opinion known to the proprietors of dairies throughout the United Kingdom; and what steps have been taken to protect the public against sales of this character.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S): We are under the impression that it is generally recognised by dairy farmers that the milk referred to is not of the character of ordinary milk, and there is no evidence that it is sold as such to any appreciable extent. We shall be glad, however, to call attention to the matter in the next issue of our monthly *Journal*.

Income-Tax Officials.

Mr. SEARS (Cheltenham): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Board of Inland Revenue have power under the Income Tax Act of 1842 to control the action of the local tax commissioners in regard to assessments; will he say whether the Board have power under this Act, or any other, to dismiss an official (clerk, parochial assessor, or collector) appointed by the said commissioners; and whether the penalties provided by the Act of 1880 to meet obstruction, negligence, etc., by clerks, assessors, and collectors in England and Wales would have to be enforced by the local commissioners who appoint them.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.): As regards the first Question, the Board of Inland Revenue, through their surveyors, have considerable powers as regards the initiation and correction of assessments. But they have no power to control the final decisions of local commissioners, except by reference to the courts and the obtaining of a judicial decision on matters in dispute. The Answer to the second Question is in the negative, and to the third, in the affirmative.

Estate Duty.

Mr. SEARS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Board of Inland Revenue has power to recover, by surcharge or other means, estate duty which has been either omitted from any affidavit or under-estimated wilfully or otherwise; and will he state whether the authority is controlled by the Statute of Limitations and restricted to three years, or extends beyond that period.

Mr. McKENNA: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The power of the Board of Inland Revenue in the matter referred to is not limited as to time, or controlled by the Statute of Limitations. The power may, however, be terminated by the issue of a certificate under Section II. of the Finance Act, 1894.

Laundry Inspection.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chairman of the Kitchen Committee if he will inform the House the names of the laundries that are employed by his Committee; whether they are State-inspected; and, if so, are trades union rates of wages paid in such laundries.

MR. JACOBY (Derbyshire, Mid.): The names of the laundries employed by the Kitchen Committee are Rogers and Cook, Limited, and the Seabrook Laundry Limited. Under the Factory Acts all laundries are State inspected, with the exception of those connected with charitable institutions. I am informed there is no trades union rates of wages, the employees being mostly women.

Wells Charities.

MR. SILCOCK (Somersetshire, Wells): I beg to ask the hon. Member for the Elland Division of Yorkshire, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether his attention has been drawn to the new scheme for the administration of Llewellyn's and Charles's charities in the city of Wells, Somerset, which provides that only three trustees shall be elected and five shall be co-opted; whether, seeing that it was the intention of the founder that the charity should be administered by the Corporation, and that for a long period it was so administered, he will give the reasons which induced the Commissioners to complete and seal a scheme before replying to the representations which they had invited from the Wells Corporation, and without giving any reasons for refusing to appoint a majority of representative trustees; and will the Commissioners take steps to give effect to the request of the Corporation and to secure that at least a majority of the trustees shall be elected.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): This Charity was removed from the control of the Wells Corporation under the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835. As I have explained on a previous occasion, the Commissioners cannot make a scheme, or amend one when made, when the income, as in this case, exceeds £50, except on application from the trustees. In the present instance, the Commissioners on their own motion proposed to introduce two representatives of the Town Council, and increased the number after publication to three, but they feel bound to exercise a discretion in such matters so as not unduly to discourage application for schemes by trustees of such large charities. The suggestions of the Town Council were fully considered, and were acknowledged on the establishment of the scheme, but the Commissioners could not undertake to enter into correspondence on the subject of such suggestions when no point has arisen requiring further investigation.

Protection of Fisheries.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can state the number and the names of the gunboats at present employed in the protection of the fisheries off the Scotch coasts; and can he state the number and the names of the gunboats supplied by the Admiralty for this purpose.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The following four vessels are cruisers under the Fishery Board:—"Vigilant," "Brenda," "Minna," and "Freya." The Admiralty has placed the "Ringdove" at the disposal of the Board for fishery protection and on occasion they grant the temporary services of a vessel for special duty. His Majesty's Ship "Hussar" has been employed this summer at Balta Sound.

MR. POWER: Will the right hon. Gentleman send a copy of that Answer to the Irish Secretary? It will strengthen his application to the Admiralty on behalf of the Irish fisheries.

Crime in Clare.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the statement of the judge at the assizes held at Ennis for the county of Clare, viz., that in not a single instance have the judges been called upon to investigate any serious crime; whether he is aware that the county of Clare has got an unqualified certificate of good character from Mr. Justice Johnston; and whether he will explain why the Government counsel were employed in the prosecution of an individual charged with the larceny of a pair of winkers.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): I have seen a newspaper report of the learned Judge's address to the Grand Jury, in which he stated that the cases for trial were in no way exceptional. Eight cases in all were tried, none of which were of a very serious character. In six of these there were convictions, and in two, acquittals. I gather from the reports of the police authorities that county Clare is, with the exception of one locality, in a satisfactory condition. In the particular case to which the hon. Member refers, the accused pleaded not guilty when before the petty sessions court, and demanded to be tried by a jury. The case having been sent forward in the ordinary way, I felt bound to direct it to be conducted by the Crown counsel. The seriousness of an offence cannot be determined alone by the value of the article stolen. The accused was convicted by the jury.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: Has the right hon. Gentleman's attention been called to that portion of the Judge's address in which, in endeavouring to describe the condition of the county, he said he could only compare it to Utopia? That is my constituency.

Mr. CHERRY: I am sorry to say I did not see a report of that portion of his address.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: That was the best part of it.

Mr. MACVEAGH: Has the hon. Gentleman's attention been called to the statement of the Judge to the effect that in order to make this an assize case the Crown added sixpence to the value of the "winkers"?

[No Answer was returned.]

Dundrum Inner Bay Crossing.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the danger and inconvenience of the crossing Dundrum inner bay at low water, he will consider, in conjunction with the Secretary of State for War, the Agricultural Board, and the local authorities, the advisability of erecting a bridge joining Ballykinlar Camp, at Redmond's Point, with Dundrum for the convenience of farmers in that agricultural centre as well as for the troops quartered there during a large portion of the year.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Bryce, Aberdeen, S.): It has been represented to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction that a bridge or causeway at the place suggested would be a great convenience to the residents of the district. The navigation, however, would have to be provided for and the project would present considerable difficulty, and in the circumstances the Department are of opinion that they would not be justified in incurring expenditure on the suggested works. I have communicated with my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War upon the subject, and he informs me that a bridge would not be of sufficient importance from a military point of view to justify the expenditure of Army funds upon it.

Mrs. Lewis's Estate, Woodford.

Mr. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what steps, if any, have been taken by the Estates Commissioners to find out whether Mrs. Lewis, of Balinagar, Woodford, county Galway, is prepared to negotiate terms of sale with a view to the reinstatement of the evicted tenants.

Mr. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they are at present in communication with the agent of the estate referred to, with the view of purchasing the lands concerned, under the provisions of Section 6 of the Act.

Cooks Town Farm, Gort.

Mr. DUFFY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the attention of the Estates Commissioners has been directed to the circumstances attending the sale of the Cooks Town farm, near Gort, belonging to Mr. Edward Martyn, Tullyra Castle, Ardrahan, county Galway; whether he is aware that a number of small tenants in the neighbourhood were looking forward anxiously to have their holdings enlarged out of this farm; can he say if the farm has been sold to a large holder of land in Kilbecanby, near Gort, by Mr. Martyn, to the exclusion of these small tenants; and will he, for the general peace and contentment of the people, take such steps as may be necessary not to allow this rumoured sale to go through.

Mr. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that two originating applications have been lodged with them by Mr. Edward Martyn for the sale of portions of his estate in county Galway. Neither of these applications, however, comprises the lands of Cooks Town to which the Question refers, and the Commissioners are not aware of the matters stated in the Question. If further particulars should be furnished to the Commissioners they will have enquiries made as to the alleged sale of the Cooks Town farm.

Limerick Evicted Tenants.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, has the inspector, deputed by the Estates Commissioners, to enquire into the cases of evicted tenants in the county of Limerick, as yet made any inquiry in regard to the evicted farm of Mr. Edward Hartigan, in Bettyville Manister, in that county, formerly held from the Rev. J. T. Lee, of Hardwicke Rectory, Cambridge; whether he is aware that the Rev. Mr. Lee has alleged that he had paid £800 for this farm of Hartigan's, and that this sum was arrived at by adding up arrears of rent on a rack-rented farm and law costs to the amount of £500; and whether, seeing that some time since negotiations for reinstatement were opened between landlord, agent, and tenant, the Estates Commissioners will use their kind services to bring to completion the proposed arrangement.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have not yet received the report of their inspector upon this case. The Commissioners have been informed by the Rev. Mr. Lee that he did not pay £800 for the tenant's interest alone. Mr. Lee states that he bought the tenant's interest at a sheriff's sale, and had to pay a considerable sum of money to a creditor who had a charge on the tenant's interest, and in addition he lost a large amount due by the tenant for rent. When the Estates Commissioners have received their inspector's report they will consider what further action they can take in the case.

MR. LUNDON: The offer by the landlord was all a bogey proceeding, was it not?

MR. BRYCE: I have no information as to that.

MR. LUNDON: A very safe reply.

Irish Magistracy—Fees on Appointment.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why the fee payable on the appointment of a magistrate in Ireland is £6, seeing that it is only 10s. in Scotland.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed that the fee of £6 payable on each Commission of the peace in Ireland is fixed by an order made a good many years ago by the then Lord Chancellor with the concurrence of the Treasury, under the provisions of the 84 Section of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act, 1877. I understand that the fee payable in Scotland is now but five shillings. The matter is not within the control of the executive Government, but I will bring the Question to the notice of the Lord Chancellor.

Irish Herring Fishery.

MR. HUGH LAW: (Donegal, W.) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that certain Scotch herring curers have been accustomed to use the name of Downings Bay, in county Donegal, as a brand for herrings not captured or cured in Ireland; and that, in seeking to gain the prices usually paid for Donegal fish, they have endangered the reputation of a special Irish product in the markets on the Continent; and whether the Irish Government will take any steps to put an end to this practice.

MR. BRYCE: The Department of Agriculture have received information to the effect that certain curers in Scotland have recently adopted the practice mentioned in the Question; and the matter is now being investigated.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman re-consider the matter seeing that the use of an Irish brand would put a stop to this practice on the part of Scottish curers?

MR. BRYCE: As far as the Department can ascertain the Irish fish curers are not favourable to having a brand, but if it can be shown that they desire it, I will reconsider the matter.

The Lord-Lieutenant and Irish Self-Government.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to a speech delivered by the Lord-Lieutenant in Cork, on the 4th July, in which he stated that His Majesty's advisers will not be forgetful of the undertaking in His Majesty's Speech from the Throne, to study most carefully what can be done for the fulfilment of the aspirations, alluded to in an address presented by the town council, in favour of the passing of a measure that would entrust to them the control of their own affairs; and, if so, whether he can give any information as to the steps intended to be taken to fulfil the aspirations alluded to.

MR. BRYCE: I may refer the hon. Member to the answer given by the First Lord of the Treasury to a Question addressed to him on Wednesday last by the hon. Member for Mid Armagh,† to which I cannot add anything.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman contrive to warn the Lord-Lieutenant that the Member for East Down has his eye upon him?

CAPTAIN CRAIG: That is unnecessary.

Court Fees at King's County Assizes.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of Thomas Young *versus* Edward Brennan at the King's County Assizes, on June 30th last, when it was proved that in certain costs taxed in the King's County county court a fee of 5s. to the crier of the King's County county court had been allowed; and whether he will consider the advisability of taking steps by legislation or otherwise to prevent such fees being charged in future.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the county court judge that as a matter of fact, no fee was allowed by him to the crier of the court in the particular case referred to, and that consequently the disallowance at assizes of the supposed fee was made under a misapprehension. In any event, the allowance of fees to criers appears to be a matter for the county court judge, with whose judicial action I have no power to interfere. I am not aware that legislation on the subject is necessary.

County Clare Police.

MR. HALPIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, taking the fact of the peaceful state of the county of Clare into consideration, he will give instructions to have the Royal Irish Constabulary force in the county reduced in number.

MR. BRYCE: At the triennial redistribution of the Royal Irish Constabulary in May last, the free force of county Clare was reduced by fifty-two men, as the result of the peaceful state of the county. The established force of the county is now 367 sergeants and constables, and this, in the opinion of the police authorities, is the lowest number with which it can at present be policed. I need hardly say that the possibility of reducing the police force in the most tranquil parts of the country will continue to engage the attention of the Irish Government.

Irish Land Prices.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the terms of reference to the Royal Commission on the Western Problem will be such as to enable the Commission to inquire into the cause of the inflation of prices under the Land Act of 1903; and how far the operation of the zones and removal of inspection have contributed to that result.

MR. BRYCE: It is not intended to direct the proposed Commission to inquire into the subject mentioned in the Question. The matters connected with the problem of congestion are so numerous and important as to be fully sufficient to occupy the attention of the Commission.

Irish Agricultural Organisation Society.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the statement made at the last meeting of the Agricultural Council, to the effect that, out of £19,000 paid by the Department since 1900, to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, £17,000 of that sum was handed away without the knowledge or approval of the Agricultural Board; whether he is aware that this statement was made by an elected member of the Agricultural Board with the concurrence of four other elected colleagues; and can he say upon what authority and for what purpose the Department disbursed this money without submitting the payments to the supervision of the Agricultural Board.

---

† See Col. 59.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed that a statement to the effect mentioned was made by an elected member of the Agricultural Board, who said that he had consulted four of his elected colleagues on the subject. The inference that the payments were made without the concurrence of the Agricultural Board is, I am informed, incorrect. The expenditure in question, which was in respect of work done for the Department by officers of the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, was undertaken with the concurrence of the Agricultural Board in the circumstances detailed in my reply to the question of the hon. Member for East Mayo on May 21st.†

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this Irish Agricultural Organisation Society is a trade society competing with private traders?

MR. BRYCE asked for notice of that Question.

Irish Poor Law Commission.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state, after his promised communication with the Commissioners, when the Report of the Poor Law Commission (Ireland) will be presented to the House; and whether he can explain the cause of the delay.

MR. BRYCE: The Commissioners inform me that they cannot yet name a definite date for the presentation of their report, but that every effort will be made to submit it to the Lord-Lieutenant with as little delay as possible.

Lord Stratheden and Campbell's Evicted Tenants.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many evicted tenants have been reinstated on the estate of Lord Stratheden and Campbell, Barna, county Galway, since the passing of the Land Purchase Act of 1903.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners have no information as to the number of evicted tenants reinstated on this estate. No applications have been received by the Commissioners from persons claiming to have been evicted from the estate. If, however, proceedings for sale should be instituted before the Commissioners, they will have due enquiry made in regard to the evicted tenants.

Lord Stratheden and Campbell's Barna Estate.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the nature of the agreements entered into for the purchase of their holdings by the tenants of Lord Stratheden and Campbell, of Barna, county Galway, and the number of years' purchase; whether the tenants had ever received reductions in rent from the courts; what is the average acreage of the holdings; what are the conditions with respect to mineral and sporting rights; whether he can say if representations have been made to the Estates Commissioners that threats have been made to compel the tenants to accept the conditions of the landlord; and if the tenants were made fully aware of the nature of the agreements into which they were entering.

MR. BRYCE: The Estate Commissioners inform me that, at the request of the owner, they have recently had a preliminary inspection made of the Barna estate, and have informed the owner that they considered that it should be sold to them under the provisions of Section 6 of the Act. No formal proceedings for sale have yet been instituted, and no agreements have been lodged. The information asked for cannot, therefore, be given. If the estate should be offered for sale to the Commissioners, they will make due enquiry under the provisions of Section 6, and, in estimating the price, will have due regard to what the tenants, who they understand are mostly non-judicial, are willing to give.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clvii., 902.

Cattle Mutilation in County Limerick.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: On behalf of the hon. Member for South Antrim, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on June 9th a case of cruelty to animals was perpetrated on an evicted farm on the Ellis estate at Abbeyfeale, county Limerick, when a cow was covered with paraffin and set fire to, and had subsequently to be destroyed; and will he say whether the police have any information as to the guilty person or persons, and as to the motive for the crime.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the police authorities that the fact is as stated in the first part of the Question. The police are pursuing their enquiries in the case, but have not yet succeeded in bringing the offender to justice. The police have no information as the motive of the offender, and even if they had it would be undesirable to state the fact.

Limerick Learner's Grievance.

*MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will explain why a learner was called upon to resign at Limerick on account of ill-health; is he aware that the learner was certified as sound in health by three medical men of eminence; and will he say why, in the circumstances of the case, the certificates of these doctors were not accepted.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I explained in writing to the hon. Member that the youth to whom he refers is not constitutionally fit for Post Office employment, and that in his own interest, as well as in the interest of the service, it is desirable that he should follow some other employment.

*MR. DELANY: Why were the certificates of the three independent medical men ignored?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I can only say that this case has been carefully considered both by my predecessor and myself.

Kingbridge Telegraph Staff.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General is he aware that a complaint was made a considerable time ago by the staff at the Kingbridge telegraph office, Dublin, with regard to the absence of facilities for obtaining meals while doing duty there; is he aware that under the present arrangement the men are compelled to visit neighbouring public houses to procure food; and can he say why no answer has been given by the controller of the Dublin telegraph office to a petition on this subject, and will he take immediate steps to improve this condition of affairs.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Two years ago the Post Office telegraphists employed in the telegraph office at Kingbridge Railway Station were allowed to use the dining room provided by the Great Southern and Western Railway Company for their staff. At the end of last year, however, the company withdrew the privilege, and as the result of the petition which was received endeavours were made to induce the company to reconsider their decision. I propose to communicate further with the company on the subject.

Irish Intermediate Education Board.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, seeing that the Intermediate Board for Ireland refused, without giving any reason, to obey the Resolution of the House of Commons, steps will be taken to have the members of the Board who refused to obey the House brought to the Bar and admonished for their misdemeanour.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): It is not the case, as the Question seems to assume, that the Board of Intermediate Education for Ireland are now refusing to obey the Resolution of the House of Commons. They are understood to have retired from the position which they at first hastily took upon the subject.

Indian Budget.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, whether, in view of the decision to take the Indian Budget upon the Morning Sitting July 20th and of the consequent curtailment of the time available for the consideration of Indian affairs upon the one day in the session devoted to India, he will move to suspend the Five o'Clock Rule upon that occasion.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There is a good deal to be said for the course which my hon. friend suggests. I believe it is not expected that the debate will go on till a late hour if the Five o'Clock Rule is suspended and, with the concurrence of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India I propose, as at present advised, to move the suspension of the Rule.

Merchant Shipping Bill.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can now say when the Report stage of the Merchant Shipping Bill will be taken.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I hope that the Report stage of the Merchant Shipping Bill will be taken towards the end of the session.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked as to the arrangements for Supply.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the arrangement at present was that Navy Estimates (Vote 8) would be taken on Friday, and the Vote for the Local Government Board on Thursday week, after which the order of Supply to be taken would be Irish Estimates, Colonial Office, and Home Office.

SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire) asked whether, on the Colonial Vote, the question of the Ceylon pearl fisheries could be discussed.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that on the Colonial Vote there would be an opportunity of discussing everything colonial.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, &c., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to printed. [No. 247.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 247.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 305.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following fifteen Members in respect of the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill: Mr. Clancy, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Charles Devlin, Mr. Field, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Joyce, Mr. Luke White, Mr. Hart Davies, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. Hugh Barrie, Mr. Fetherstonshaugh and Mr. James Campbell.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee: That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill; Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. Herbert Samuel, and Mr. Cremer; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. James Bryce, and Mr. John Williams.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported: That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, in respect of the Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill: Mr. Halley Stewart; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Watt.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 10:—

Sir WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) moved the omission of sub-section (1), in order to allow the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education to make an addition to the clause by the insertion therein of the names of the Commissioners.

Amendment proposed—

"To omit sub-section (1)."—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) said this matter had escaped his attention. He was perfectly willing that the names should be inserted in the clause. He had not got all the titles of the Commissioners with him, so perhaps he might be allowed to move the insertion of the names, and add the dignities on Report.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'three Commissioners to be appointed by his Majesty' and to insert the words 'The Right Hon. Sir Arthur Wilson, K.C.I.E., Sir Hugh Owen, G.C.B., and Mr. Worsley-Taylor, K.C.'"—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause"—put, and negatived.

Words inserted.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) next moved the omission of sub-section (3). He wished to know what estimate had been made of the expenses of the Commission and where the money was to come from. He brought forward his Motion in order to hear the opinion of the Government upon the matter. The noble Lord also wished to know whether a sub-commission would be appointed.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 14, to leave out 'sub-section (3).'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. BIRRELL said it was, he believed, the intention of the Government that the remuneration of the Commissioners should come out of the million of money to be provided under Clause 12. The Resolution before the House was formulated in that way. The remuneration of the Commissioners would be settled as soon as an arrangement had been made with these gentlemen, and he dared say the amount would be determined by the number of sittings they held, or something of that kind. That was the only answer he could give at the present time. With regard to the appointment of sub-commissioners, the Government did not contemplate taking such a step.

Lord BALCARRES said that as Clause 12 stood in the Bill the million of money was to be distributed among the local education authorities, and unless the right hon. Gentleman meant that the three Commissioners were to be paid by the local authorities his arguments fell to the ground. They had had a specific declaration from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that this million was not to be provided during the present financial year, and therefore there would be a gap during which the Commissioners would be engaged and it would be impossible to pay them the money owed them by the State. He thought they required some elucidation of the point; he did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman would give it them at the present time?

Mr. BIRRELL said he had already answered the Question according, he believed, to the view taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the matter.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said that if those were the views of the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the matter it was evident the right hon.

Gentleman had not read the Bill, or he would have realised that some change was necessary in Clause 12. He thought he could say what had happened without much difficulty. There had been a conversation between the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education and the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The former had seen that it was impossible to get any more than a million pounds, and so the matter had been left there. He, however, contended that it could not be left there, and it was not sufficient that they should alter Clause 12; in fact Clause 12 should be left as it was as far as the present point was concerned, but a new section would have to be introduced specifically stating that these gentlemen were to receive remuneration by statute.

MR. BIRRELL said they were, up to the present, quite in order. The Resolution provided for the million pounds and also for the remuneration of the Commissioners. If any inaccuracy had been committed it was by himself in saying that the remuneration of the Commission should come out of the million. It was provided that the remuneration of the Commissioners should come out of the public funds, and therefore it was not necessary to alter Clause 12. He would, he thought, be able to make clear to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer that this remuneration would come from outside the million pounds.

LORD BALCARRES pointed out that it was imperative that the moneys to be provided for these gentlemen should be set out in the financial Estimates.

MR. BIRRELL replied that it might be necessary to provide supplementary Estimates.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) asked whether it would not be necessary to have a supplementary Estimate for the remuneration of the Commission, on which the House might discuss its constitution.

MR. BIRRELL: That is most likely.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) moved an Amendment to subsection (5)—"To insert after the word 'Commissioners,' the words, 'each of them' with the additional words 'subject to an appeal to the three Commissioners sitting together.'" He took it that the duties of the three Commissioners were to make inquiries into and examine trusts and then formulate schemes for the carrying on of the schools. The men who had to do this work must be men of high legal standing and men accustomed to the examination of witnesses, and under such circumstances the work to be done by these gentlemen could not be delegated to men in subordinate positions. Especially was this necessary in view of the fact that the court had power to inflict imprisonment for contempt of court. It seemed to him, however, that unless the clause was altered a great deal of the work of the Commission would have to be done by clerks. He was sure it was the desire of the Government that the Commissioners should decide each case upon its merits and to see that none received unjust treatment. There were 14,000 voluntary scoools in England and Wales, all of which, with the exception of 200 or 300, were held under charitable trusts. Each one of these schools might come before the Commissioners—he did not say it was likely—but there was the possibility of their doing so. At any rate, let them say that one in every ten would come before the Commission; that would mean that the Commissioners would have to make 1,400 schemes for that number of schools. Let them see what time the Commissioners had got. They were allowed two years under the Bill, so that they would have to dispose of these 1,400 schemes in two years. If they worked every day in the week, which they would not wish to do, they would have to make two schemes each day. The Commissioners, however, could not be expected to do that; they would want holidays, and, therefore, if they reckoned on 170 or 180 working days in the year it would then mean that they would have to make four schemes in one day. He asked the Committee to consider, under these circumstances, whether the Commissioners would be able to give full and adequate consideration to each scheme. He did not think they would, and therefore, the object of his Amendment—which was a perfectly friendly one—was that these Commissioners should have the power to work alone and make schemes alone, with the right of appeal to them sitting together in cases where trustees were of opinion that they had been unjustly dealt with. He thought that some such Amendment was necessary in the interest of the good working of the Act.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 20, after word 'Commissioners' to insert the word 'each of them, subject to an appeal to the three Commissioners sitting together.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked the right hon. Gentleman, before answering on the Amendment, to give some estimate of the amount of work which these Commissioners would be required to carry out. His hon. friend had contended that the amount of work was so great that if the Commissioners had to sit together they would never get through their task in the time allowed by the Bill. He confessed his hon. friend's Amendment frightened him. He had every confidence in the three gentlemen appointed. He thought they were all judicial men with great knowledge, but he had, however, greater confidence in the judgment arrived at by the three sitting together than the judgment of only one of them, even if there were the right of appeal to the whole body. He should be sorry to see such an Amendment adopted. If his hon. friend's contention was right, and the Government were also of opinion that the Commissioners could not get through their duties in the time allotted, then some other machinery must be tried than that comprised in the Bill, but he hoped it would not be the same as that advocated by his hon. friend the mover of the Amendment.

MR. BIRRELL said he fully appreciated the remarks of his right hon. friend and of the hon. Member for Blackpool. The Government had made very cautious inquiries, and the advice they had obtained did not enable them to form any estimate of the work these gentlemen would have to do. It would all depend upon temper, the manner in which the negotiations were carried out under Clause 2, upon the general feeling of the district with regard to the Bill, and upon other circumstances over which it would be impossible for anyone to cast more than a cautious eye. Therefore, although he felt pretty certain that in many parts of the country the labour of the Commissioners would be limited to work quite within their capacity, he would not like to say in answer to the straightforward question of the right hon. Gentleman that they had been able to form any estimate which would provide an adequate answer. It was of the utmost importance that the decisions of the Court should be uniform and command respect. He at first thought of meeting the difficulty by appointing assistant Commissioners to make preliminary inquiries and report to the Commission; but on consideration he had come to the conclusion that that course would not be necessary. He should like to have an opportunity of consulting the three Commissioners as to what their view might be upon the subject. But personally he thought that, though the cases might be numerous, a few months of the work would enable the three Commissioners sitting together to discover that the things which they had to decide fell on the same lines. They would have the same kind of problem to solve in the different cases brought before them. They would soon get to know, and the local authorities and trustees would also get to know what they had to do. Therefore on the whole he thought the Committee had better stand by the clause as it was. He would, however, take the opportunity of consulting with the Commissioners and seeing what their notions of procedure might be. They would consider the suggestion about appointing sub-Commissioners to visit places, collect information, and transmit it to the Commissioners for the purpose of enabling them to form their judgment, but he was not at all sure that that would be a satisfactory way of proceeding. The parties could state their case in writing, or in any other way that might be necessary. He thought, therefore, that he would not accept the Amendment. He ought, perhaps, to mention what he overlooked on a former occasion, that Mr. Worsley-Taylor's acceptance of the position of one of the Commissioners was conditional on the state of his health, but he had reason to hope that that gentleman would find it possible to undertake the duties.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he could quite understand that the right hon. Gentleman could not give the Committee precise information as to the amount of work likely to fall on the Commissioners. There were a certain number of privately owned schools which, under no circumstances, would come before the Commission. Then there were certain schools held on mixed trusts which, as they now understood, will also be exempt. Then again there were certain circumstances in which the trustees might choose to go to the Board of Education, and not to the Commissioners. It might therefore be impossible to say what was the probable number of schools whose cases might be brought before the Commissioners, but could they not be told what was the proportion of schools privately owned to trust schools?

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) asked whether the Commissioners would always sit in London or whether they would be encouraged to go to places in the country as might seem desirable. He thought a great deal of friction might be avoided if they took the latter course. It was difficult to put on paper all the local conditions which ought to be taken into consideration. He might further suggest that the work of the Commissioners would be easier if more favourable terms were given to voluntary schools in respect of religious instruction.

MR. BIRRELL said that so far as moving about was concerned it was a matter which would be left in the hands of the Commissioners. They would determine the places of meeting, and it was not proposed to lay down any rule on the subject. He did not anticipate that their duty would necessarily require to be performed in the atmosphere of the place. As to the question asked by the hon. Baronet, he did not think that the maximum number of schools about which controversy would arise, and which could by any possibility come before the Commission would be found to be very large. It was difficult to estimate the number.

LORD BALCARRES said his impression was that in every doubtful case the parties would go to the Commission. The Minister for Education had clearly stated that the Commissioners were to sit together and not to be separated. He thought that would make the appointment of sub-Commissioners necessary—not men with executive power, but men, for instance, like the inspectors of the Board of Education, who would make inquiries as to matters of fact and report the results to the Commission itself. The right hon. Gentleman apparently thought that the Commissioners need not breathe the atmosphere of the locality in order to determine the nature of the school. He dared say they need not, but he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the question of their procedure and place of meeting was within the discretion of the Commission itself. It would be a great hardship to the owners or trustees of schools if they were required in every case of dispute between themselves and the local education authority to come to London to lay their case before the Commissioners. There should be statutory power given to the Commissioners to appoint sub-Commissioners, but he did not see that they had such power under the clause as it stood. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider before the Report stage whether the words of the clause were sufficiently broad to enable the Commissioners to appoint sub-Commissioners.

LORD MORPETH (Birmingham, S.) said he considered it very important that the Commission should go round to the various localities. They were more likely to come to an amicable understanding if they met the trustees and the representatives of the local education authorities on the spot. It would often be very difficult to get trustees and county councillors to come to London, and, therefore, he urged the right hon. Gentleman to introduce a provision in the Bill requiring the Commissioners to go about the country. He regarded with some doubt the policy of having assistant Commissioners. He thought there would be greater safety in going before the Commissioners themselves. The persons who gave the decisions should be the persons who heard the evidence and saw the trustees. If assistant Commissioners heard the evidence it would be almost certain that the decisions of the Commissioners would be coloured by the reports received from them. He would have more confidence if the Commission went down and heard all the evidence and saw the persons concerned.

Mr. PAUL (Northampton) asked whether there was any reason to suppose that the legal effect of the trusts could only be estimated in the atmosphere of the place concerned.

*Mr. ASHLEY said the Amendment had not received the support which he should have expected, but none of the speakers had suggested a more workable plan whereby the schemes could be got through in a reasonable time. He asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn

Lord HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) moved an Amendment providing that the right to continue in force, after December 31st, 1908, the powers of the Commission should be vested in Parliament instead of His Majesty by Order in Council as the clause proposed. He thought this was a matter of some importance. The question whether the exceptional powers conferred on these Commissioners should be continued or not was one which Parliament should have an opportunity of discussing. Why was part of reviewing the work of the Commission taken away from Parliament? It was just as well, he submitted, when the question of the continuance of the Star Chamber arose that Parliament should have an opportunity of discussing their action during the time they had held office. He would not suggest to the Committee what should be decided by Orders in Council; but he would say that Orders in Council were intended to deal with minor details of administration and not with the body expressly set up by Parliament to carry out these functions. If Parliament set the Commission up, Parliament ought to have a say as to whether their services should be continued or not. Then as to subsection (3), which provided that the remuneration of the Commissioners and all expenses of the Commission incurred in the execution of this Act should be paid out of monies provided by Parliament, that seemed to him, in itself, a sufficient justification for the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 27, to leave out the words 'His Majesty may by Order in Council,' and insert 'Parliament may.'"—(*Viscount Helmsley.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. BIRRELL said that if the noble Lord had had to search through the proceedings of the Star Chamber as often as he had had in the course of his historical crazes, he would have had a respect for it, at all events inasmuch as its proceedings were consistent with the principles of the Tory Party. The Star Chamber was a prerogative Court, which the proposed Commission was not. This Commission was created by the authority of Parliament and the term "Star Chamber" ought not to be applied to it at all.

Lord HELMSLEY said he was glad to note from the remarks of the right hon. the Minister for Education that this Commission was not to be a Star Chamber.

Mr. BIRRELL said that at all events this Commission was created by the authority of Parliament and therefore was not open to any of the objections urged against the machinery of the ancient tribunal of the Star Chamber. He really thought that when the noble Lord saw that Parliament, having created this Court, having assigned to it certain business, having been obliged to say what was the amount of business the Court would have to do, and not knowing how long it would take the Court to do that business, it was only reasonable and proper that some means should exist of prolonging its existence for three, six, or twelve months. Fortunately there was at hand a very rational means by Orders in Council of prolonging the existence of the jurisdiction which this House had set up. The only reason the Government inserted those words was that they wished to put an end to the Commission when it had done its work, adding a reasonable precaution for providing for its prolongation if its work was not concluded by the date inserted.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he himself was going to suggest that without this sub-section a new Act of Parliament would be required if the Court did not do its work within one year. His noble friend only said that this machinery of Orders in Council should not be resorted to until necessity arose, and it only became necessary because of the insertion of a time limit. They could not imagine that the gentlemen composing the Court would unduly drag on their proceedings. There was no power to hurry them; and no power to delay them when they had a specific and well-defined job before them. Why, then, put a limit to their time? Parliament had brought them into being and they were an absolutely independent tribunal. When the Court had done its work it should be dissolved by a natural process.

Lord HELMSLEY begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question, "That Clause 9, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put and agreed to.

Clause 10.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) moved to insert after the words "charitable trusts," the words, "solely of an educational character." He understood that the position of the Government was that only trusts of an educational character should be handed over, but there was nothing in Clause 10 which directed anybody to have any regard to the trusts on which the schoolhouses were held; and, therefore, the local educational authority could take possession of schoolhouses which were held under a loose trust. He consequently ventured to suggest to the Government that some such words as he had moved should be inserted if they wished to confine the operation of the clause to the schools which they really had in view. There were a large number of schoolhouses which were held partly for educational and partly for religious purposes, and it might well be that very great hardship would be inflicted upon those who wished to use the schoolhouses for purposes other than educational. They might for a whole year or longer be deprived of the use of the schoolhouse because the local educational authority chose to demand the use of it without considering the effect upon the other persons interested.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 2, after the words 'charitable trusts,' to insert the words 'solely of an educational character.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

Mr. BIRRELL said that a difficulty might arise between the local education authority and the trustees when the premises were held in trust for school or Church or other purposes. But in that sense the trust could not be held as a trust solely for educational purposes. All that was wanted was that the school premises should be held by the local education authority until the dispute had been settled by the Commission. There could be no interference with the other part of the trust. It was obvious that if the premises were used as a school for five days in the week the educational trust excluded other parts of the trust, which only came into operation when the premises were vacated as a school. The educational trust excluded the other charitable trust only when the educational trust was in operation, and when the educational trust was finished the other trust came into possession of the school premises. They could not do two things at once, at the same time and in the same place. The local education authority could only require the use of the school premises when these had been always dedicated to educational purposes. Therefore any interference with other trusts could not by any possibility arise. It would give rise to doubt and possible dissension to alter the words, and he could not see that the Amendment would make any legal difference.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that he understood the object of the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education in inserting this clause was to avoid the inconvenience which would arise from schools being closed under the provisions contained in the earlier portions of the Bill in consequence of failure to come to an arrangement before the 1st January, 1908. If a local authority temporarily used a school as a public elementary school it was, it seemed to him, bound to observe the conditions upon which the school was run before. He confessed that as he understood the clause he did not think his noble friend need be anxious as to the precise character of the user of the school. The school would be used under the precise conditions of a voluntary school upon which it was used before the Bill came into operation. It might be necessary to insert words later in the clause to ensure that these conditions were maintained.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster) inquired what the effect of the clause would be upon a school, which on the passing of this Bill had converted itself into a certified school. Would it be possible for the local education authority to come in, if the public elementary school accommodation was insufficient, and interrupt the whole arrangements and progress of the certified school and take it for the purposes of public elementary school education?

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said the contingency contemplated by the hon. Gentleman could scarcely arise. If an existing voluntary school was changed into a certified school there would be no deficiency of school accommodation in regard to the district it served. Then this clause would not come into operation at all. If, however, it changed its character and the class of its scholars, a deficiency might arise and then it would be proper that this clause should operate and that the local education authority should have power to say that the teachers and scholars who had previously occupied a place in our national system of education no longer did so and that a deficiency had been caused without an opportunity being given to them of making it good. The local authority had a right to say that they should have adequate and proper notice that the premises were not available for the purpose of enabling them to give proper accommodation. If the trustees chose to alter the character of their school so as to make a deficiency in school accommodation, of course the powers of the local authority would come into force.

LORD R. CECIL thought that in his desire to be brief he had not made himself clear. The point was this. The only limiting words in this clause were that the local education authority were to have the power to acquire the schoolhouse for the purpose of carrying on a public elementary school, and they could only judge what the use of that would be to the local education authority by supposing that it would be carried on as a public elementary school. If the trustees thought that the local education authority were going beyond their powers and were not carrying on the school for the purposes if a public elementary school, and if the trustees appealed to a Court, that Court would say that the local education authority must be the judge, and they could not interfere if the authority told them that their user was necessary for the purpose of carrying on a public elementary school. If the Committee looked at sub-section (2) of the clause they would see that it was provided that while a schoolhouse was used under the powers given by the section, the same conditions and provisions should apply as where an arrangement was made for the use of a schoolhouse, except that the local education authority should permit the religious instruction given in the school to be of the same character as that previously given and also permit the teachers in the school to give that instruction as part of their duties. That, as he understood, with other provisions of the Bill, gave the local education authority power to carry out during the year they were in possession any alterations or improvements that they thought necessary for the purpose of carrying on a public elementary school, and they might so change the character of the building as to make it useless except for that purpose. That was a danger which should be guarded against. He thought the owners were entitled to have some restriction put upon the local education authority to prevent them from using their powers so as to unfit the school for the purpose for which it had hitherto been used. At the end of the period it must be remembered that the local education authority might not take over the school and they might be even building meanwhile another school to take its place.

MR. BIRRELL did not think the noble Lord could be accused of repeating himself, as in his second speech he had said many things which he did not say in his first. As to that second part, for himself he must say he could not conceive that the use of the schoolhouse for the purpose of an elementary school by the local education authority would be any greater than it was by the authority previously existing. The user would be the same as it had been up to the present. Then the noble Lord raised another point and said that the local authority, having got possession of the school under this section, would proceed to spend a great amount of money upon it, and then, having spent that money, would go out at the end of the year and leave the result of their expenditure behind them. Local authorities might be pig-headed in the opinion of certain misguided persons, but they were not likely to spend money on a schoolhouse and then give up the results of their expenditure.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR did not think that the point of his noble friend had been met. The right hon. Gentleman had drawn a picture of the local authority spending vast sums of money upon improving another person's property, while all the time they were building another school. He did not conceive that his noble friend was referring to such a far-fetched case as that, but the pulling down of a partition or anything of that sort might do a vast amount of damage to a school for the purposes for which it was being used. He thought, however, that his noble friend would see that the proper place to raise his Amendment was lower down in the clause, and he thought he should reserve it.

LORD R. CECIL asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) moved to omit from page 6, line 34, the words, "without payment" with a view of inserting later on, in line 38, the words "And such use shall be had during such period in such manner and upon such terms as to payment and otherwise as shall be agreed between the local education authority and the owners of the schoolhouse, or in default of agreement shall be determined by the Board of Education." He did not see why, if rent was to be payable under Clause 2, it should not also be payable for the temporary user of the schools allowed by this clause. The school was being taken compulsorily and for a public purpose, and he thought that payment should be made to the trustees. As the clause stood the local education authority could say that, unless the trustees accepted the terms offered under Clause 2, they (the authority) would, under Clause 10, take the school for twelve months for nothing. That did not seem to be a very fair position in which to place the owners of the schools. The effect of such a proceeding would be that the whole thing would be hung up for twelve months and nobody could know what might happen at the end of that time, while at the same time no public money would be given by the local authority to the trustees of the school to enable them to carry out their trust. It might be asked what the trustees were going to spend the money on. They would incur heavy legal expenses during the year, and have no funds out of which to pay these expenses; they ought therefore to have a payment from this source.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do they get payment now?

*MR. CAVE said they did not get payment now, but they had their own property for their own use, and so long as they had that, no payment was required. When the State took away a man's property for State purposes, up to the present the State had always paid for it, and so far as he knew this was the first time that that principle had not been followed. Again, in the question of repairs, there ought to be an opportunity for a stipulation on the part of the owners that the local authority should not do any unnecessary damage, but should, during the operation of this clause, keep the building in repair. All these things ought to be settled by a fair agreement between the owners and the local authority; or, failing such agreement, by the Board of Education. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman understood how harsh and unfair these provisions appeared to those interested in these schools. He did not contend against this clause if properly amended, because he quite saw that in view of the passing of Clause 1, there ought to be some interval allowed during which the local authority should be allowed to see that the school was carried on, but while that might be necessary, he thought there should be some concession made in this matter to the owners. He did not ask for payment in all cases; what he asked the Committee to do was to leave the matter in the hands of the Board of Education.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 34, to leave out the words 'without payment.'"—(*Mr. Cave.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause.

MR. BIRRELL said he was bound to confess that the speech of his hon. and learned friend, one of the most fair-minded men in the House, filled him almost with despair. Whatever he might have thought of the other clauses in this Bill he did think that Clause 10 would appeal to right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite. The hon. and learned Gentleman said they were taking the trustees' property away. Why, they were maintaining and repairing it; they were taking upon themselves the whole expense in regard to it; they were relieving the trustees of all pecuniary liability in respect of it. They were not touching, altering, or affecting the religious instruction that was going on in the school—["Oh."]—no, not during this year. It would go on exactly as it was going on ow—the same teachers, the same denominational conditions, and therefore they were putting money into the pocket of the owners. And then the hon. and learned Gentleman, whose character he admitted, said—he did not actually use the word "robbing"—they were for the first time in English history taking away property without paying for it. They were paying for it. Running a school was not a profitable occupation, like running a public-house. It was a public purpose which they fulfilled. They had assumed every possible obligation with regard to these schools, and he really did not see what more they could have done. He thought this was as fair and reasonable a clause as it was possible to have framed. The hon. and learned Gentleman's contention that the owners ought to have the money in their pockets for trust purposes was absolutely unreasonable, and he thought this was not an Amendment that should be pressed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that if the policy of the Government was what the right hon. Gentleman had just said, he did not think the Amendment need be pressed. But let it be understood that that was their policy, and that if they could show that in any single respect the position of the schools was not the same as in the time when the teaching was under the control of the managers, then the Government were bound in honour to see that that was put straight. That being the understanding, he would suggest that they need not divide on the Amendment.

MR. BIRRELL: We will see what the understanding is when we come to the clause.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked what, then, came of the argument of the right hon. Gentleman? If the right hon. Gentleman would tell them now that, if they could show that under the clause as it was drafted there could be a modification of the manner in which the school had been carried on up to this peculiar and special year, he would do his best to accept Amendments which would put that straight, then he would advise the withdrawal of this Amendment. But if the right hon. Gentleman would not give that pledge, what became of his argument, of his passionate denunciation of his hon. and learned friend ?

MR. BIRRELL said he had not in his mind every particular Amendment that might be on the Paper. He was dealing with the financial position of the school, and he said that it would be better off financially under these conditions than it was before, and that, therefore, he did not quite see how any claim for the payment of rent could be made. The clause was framed in a fair spirit so as to secure that the religious teaching in the school should not be affected during the period it was temporarily under the control of the local authority.

*MR. CAVE. having regard to the right hon. Gentleman's speech, asked leave to withdraw the Amendment. [MINISTERIAL cries of "No."]

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then we will divide.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 343; Noes, 98. (Division List No. 205.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets, S.Geo.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, T. R. (Essex Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.(Bedfordshire)
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, Rt.Hn.James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.

Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,Sir T.Glen. (Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, SirW.J.(St.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A- (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St Pancras, E.)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lutterell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Cent.)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Villiers, Ernest Amherst
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arnold-Forster,Rt Hn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J(City Lond.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish,Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon,SirW.Evans-(T'rHam.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(Bury S.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn.Col.W.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar(Dulwich)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt.Hn Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Col.CharlesW.(Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,JohnFrederickPeel
Roberts,S. (Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Saunderson,RtHn.Col.Edw.J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone W.)
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark.
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E.(Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt.Hn. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Cave and Mr. Bridgeman.

MR. ASHLEY moved to insert words in the clause limiting the use of the schoolhouse of an existing voluntary school held under charitable trusts, in so far as it was necessary for the purpose of carrying on a public elementary school "in accordance with the terms of the trust," till January 1st, 1909. The Minister for Education a few days ago had stated that it was his opinion that this clause would enable a voluntary school to be carried on during the year practically and substantially as it was now being carried on. There was, however, an important exception to that. Under the clause the local education authority might during the year dismiss the head or any teacher and appoint a teacher entirely opposed to the religious views of the trustees, and all he asked was that the Minister for Education should carry out what he was sure was the intention of the Government—that there should be continuity of policy during the year. It was no use for the right hon. Gentleman to make friendly and amicable speeches. The Commissioners could only interpret the Act; and they would not pay the slightest attention to speeches in this House.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 36, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'in accordance with the terms of the trust.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said he did not think the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman would really do him or the cause he had at heart any good. It was not at all a desirable thing that the onus should be put upon the local education authority of interpreting the trust. A good many of these Church schools were not carried on according to any trusts whatever. If the local authority found it necessary to take over the school it would allow the same religious instruction to go on as before without any burrowing and diving into the trusts. He did not think that the insertion of these words would either be useful or effect the object which the hon. Member had in view. The general purpose of the clause was to preserve the continuity of the school. In case the school was not taken over nobody desired that its religious history should be rudely broken. He did not think any difficulties would arise, but if an alteration was necessary it should be made later on.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON agreed that if any precautions were necessary on this point they should be taken later in the clause. During the year the local authority would have taken over the greater number of the voluntary schools, and would use them as non-provided schools under Clauses 1 and 2 with full control over them. But side by side with them there would be those schools which the local authority were running on voluntary lines.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton) said his Amendment extended the period to 1910 or such date as the Board of Education might decide. Apart from Clause 10, there was nothing in the Bill enabling the Local Education Authority to retain the use of the schoolhouses, pending the arrangements being completed under Clauses 2 and 8. The education authorities might want to look round to see whether they could procure sites in order to build schools before the present schools passed out of their hands. Under the local education authority of which he was a member. they had no fewer than 559 schools to be transferred, and although they hoped to draw up some agreement by which the bulk of them would be willingly, cheerfully, and promptly transferred, they had always to bear in mind that there were other pig-headed people besides local authorities and they sometimes came across pig-headed parsons, pig-headed diocesan authorities, and pig-headed trustees, and the transfer of the schools might take a little time. How long the Judicial Commission would be over its work even the President of the Board of Education said he could not forecast. Under the Bill the powers of the Commissioners might be extended indefinitely, and he submitted that there should be a little more elasticity with regard to the date. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 38, to leave out at the end of sub-section the word 'nine' and to insert the words 'ten, or such later date as the Board of Education may in any case decide.' "—(*Mr. Clough.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'nine' stand part of the Clause."

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, W.) said he should support the substitution of ten for nine. That would be fair and reasonable and would give both parties time to look round. It would give more elasticity to the proceedings. It would also enable the teachers in the schools to look round and find other posts. He hoped the President of the Board of Education would see his way to alter the date from 1909 to 1910, although he could not agree to leaving the matter to the Board of Education to decide.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said he was not satisfied as to who was going to pay the expense of the repairs during this period under the clause.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order order! That question does not arise on this Amendment.

LORD R. CECIL hoped the Government would accept this Amendment, although he would prefer to leave the date to the local authority rather than to the Board of Education. If his suggestion were adopted it would give further elasticity instead of a hard and fast date. To him one year seemed insufficient to get through the considerable amount of negotiations that must take place under the Bill. The year 1909 would give a very short period for all the negotiations with reference to the transfer of the schools, and therefore some means of extending that period was absolutely essential, otherwise they would be brought to an absolute *impasse.* He hoped the Government would see their way to accept some such Amendment as would give them an extra year in which to conclude negotiations.

Mr. BIRRELL said that, considering the amount of work which the Board of Education would have to do in the future, he could not be a party to adding to their duties by leaving the Board to fix the date. He thought there was a great advantage in having a fixed period. He was quite willing under the circumstances to accept an amendment substituting "ten" for "nine."

Mr. CLOUGH said he should be pleased to move his Amendment in the amended form suggested.

Lord BALCARRES: Perhaps the hon. Member would have no objection to inserting the local authority in place of the Board of Education.

Question put and negatived.

Question, "That the word 'ten' be there inserted"—put, and agreed to.

Lord R. CECIL moved to insert in the second sub-section of the clause the words "not do anything which shall render the schoolhouse less fit for the other purposes of the trust and shall." His object was to make it clear that during the temporary possession of the schoolhouse, which was now extended to two years, the local education authority should do nothing which would interfere with its use for the other purposes for which it was held. He thought if the Minister for Education would bear in mind the exceedingly wide powers conferred upon the local education authority by Clause 2, he would see that in the case of a really hostile local education authority—and there were some—it was necessary that some words should be inserted for the protection of the beneficiaries of the trusts beyond the strictly educational trusts.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 4, after the word 'shall,' to insert the words 'not do anything which shall render the schoolhouse less fit for the other purposes of the trust and shall.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. BIRRELL said the Amendment raised a difficulty in his mind. As to the general purpose of the Amendment he quite agreed with the noble Lord, but it seemed to him that the insertion of these words might give rise to the possibility of disputes between the parties. Everybody would agree that it would be a most improper and unreasonable thing for the local education authority to put up anything of a permanent character which would interfere with the other uses of the schoolhouse during the time it was not used by the local education authority. On the other hand there were certain alterations which from time to time became necessary in the course of the conduct of a school—as, for example, a new class-room was constructed, or something was walled off, screened off, or partitioned off. Then a question might arise between the local education authority and the trustees as to whether that was in excess of their proper user. If the words of the Amendment were accepted disputes and discord would arise. That was the difficulty he felt. The local education authority had, after all, to discharge an educational duty, and it had to see that the premises were suitable for the particular purpose it had to carry out. Of course, a good deal would depend on the character of the alterations which the local education authority might make from time to time. He thought the words proposed by the noble Lord were rather stronger than the necessity of the case required, and that the safeguard which the noble Lord considered necessary would be given if words were inserted to provide that the alterations made should be such as to render the premises fit and proper for use as a school. He was entirely at one with the noble Lord in the general desire, yet he foresaw a source of irritation and litigation between the local authorities and the trustees of the school if the words proposed were inserted. The trustees might say that something had been done which was inconvenient for the other purposes of the school. Therefore, he hoped the noble Lord would not press the Amendment. He thought the matter was one of importance, and he would consider whether he could not introduce words which would limit as much as possible any friction between the parties. He did not want to tie the hands of the local authority. He could conceive that certain trustees might not like any alteration. If the noble Lord would withdraw his Amendment he really would be very much obliged to him.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the Minister for Education had made a most delicate appeal to his noble friend, but the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten that about half an hour ago he made light of the idea that any local authority would make alterations on any other body's property which was to be held, as was now provided, for two years. If the local authorities were not going to be such fools as to make alterations on somebody else's property, of which they had the use for two years, he could not see what objection the right hon. Gentleman had to this Amendment. Would he accept the Amendment if his noble friend proposed to put in the words "shall not make any permanent alteration which shall render the schoolhouse less fit for the other purposes of the trust?" He suggested these words as a compromise between the respective opinions of the right hon. Gentleman and his noble friend who appeared to be very close in the matter of policy.

MR. BIRRELL said he had not had an opportunity of considering the words. He would like a little time for consideration. He thought the words suggested by the Leader of the Opposition were of the kind which should be introduced.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL said this was really the same Amendment as he proposed on Clause 2. The objection raised by the Government on that occasion was that there was an appeal to the Board of Education. In this case they had a proposal of the same kind, but without the security provided under Clause 2.

MR. BIRRELL: This is a very different thing. This is temporary user.

SIR FRANCIS POWELL said if it was temporary user it really could not be necessary that the local authority should enter upon expensive alterations which might cause great inconvenience. He, therefore, thought that some security of the kind proposed was necessary for the protection of the owners of the school. Was the cost of the repairs and maintenance to be borne by the local education authority or the owners?

LORD R. CECIL thanked the Minister for Education for his promise to consider the matter. He asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD BALCARRES moved an Amendment that it should be an obligation upon the local education authority to make certain that the religious teaching given in the school during the period of transfer was the same as that hitherto given. He thought that such an Amendment was very necessary. These schools under their existing conditions and *status* gave religious instruction of a particular character, and as they were going to be *quasi* transferred to the local education authority for a limited period pending a decision as to their ultimate fate by the Commissioners, he thought it only right that the local education authority should not content themselves with permitting the religious instruction previously given to be continued, but should secure that that instruction was really given. He imagined that this was an Amendment which the right hon. Gentleman would be prepared to accept in order to secure that the schools during the intervening period should continue substantially in the same position in regard to religious instruction until their *status* was decided by the Commission of three.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 5, to leave out the word 'permit' and insert the word 'cause.'"—(*Lord Balcarres*).

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said that throughout the discussions on the Bill they had used phrases such as "special religious instruction" and "religious instruction of the same kind as previously given," but they had had no reference to the particular religious teaching intended, nor was there any security that the teaching would continue of the same character. The Amendment proposed to make it obligatory on the local education authority to secure that the religious teaching given in the schools temporarily taken over should be of the same character as that previously given. But who was to determine whether it was of the same character? What an obligation to put on the local education authority! It was perfectly true there were religious bodies with absolutely rigid, or, at any rate, well-defined, religious principles, about whose religious teaching no question could possibly arise. But that was not true of all religious bodies, and least of all was it true of the Church of England. He would be glad if the Minister for Education would turn his mind seriously to this aspect of the problem, leaving controversial matters for the more satisfying region of ecclesiastical research. He held in his hand the Report issued by the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in the Church of England—[OPPOSITION cries of "Order"]—and he would invite the Committee to consider the serious nature of the problems raised by that Report.

THE CHAIRMAN said the question which the hon. Member was raising was not, in his opinion, relevant.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said they never knew what would happen in the Church, but the Amendment on the question was whether it should be obligatory on the local authority to make sure that the teaching of the Church of England continued to be of the same character as heretofore. However, the Report to which he referred showed that there was no security.

LORD R. CECIL, on a point of order, asked if it could possibly be relevant to discuss the Report of the Royal Commission. The only question raised was whether the religious teaching was to be of the same character as had been given before, and in what way that was to be secured. The question whether there was a considerable variety of religious teaching in the Church of England was not germane to the subject.

THE CHAIRMAN said that discussion on the Report of the Commission would, of course, be out of order, but the hon. Member had not yet begun to discuss it.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said he was only showing by illustration the difficulties which would fall on the local authority if the Amendment were carried. Under the Act of 1902 there was an appeal to the bishop as regards religious instruction, but they were going to alter that, and under the Bill there would be no appeal to the bishop. One clergyman might direct the teaching in his school without any reference whatever to the bishop of the diocese. This was really a very serious matter, because whenever bishops had tried to exert their authority they had met with extreme difficulty. He found on page 75 of this Report that——

THE CHAIRMAN said the Amendment had nothing to do with lawlessness in the Church of England.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said that with all respect he submitted that the question of the continuity of a particular kind of religious teaching was involved, and the local authority was stepping into the shoes of the bishop. Therefore he was fairly justified in calling the attention of the Committee to the extreme difficulty which the bishops had experienced in regulating the affairs in their own dioceses. [OPPOSITION cries of "Order."]

THE CHAIRMAN: That does not arise.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said he did not wish to irritate hon. Members opposite, but would proceed to deal with specific allegations in regard to the character of the teaching. The Church of England was in the melting-pot, from a theological point of view, and therefore it was from that point of view that he wished to direct attention to the serious obligation there was to arrest unlawful teaching in Church of England schools. The Report said that in a large number of Churches there were illegal lights, incense and illegal practices in the service of the Holy Communion——

THE CHAIRMAN said he could not see what that had to do with the question. He must warn the hon. Member that he was becoming highly irrelevant.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR said he bowed to the Chairman's decision; but he would really advise the Committee to study the position in which they might find themselves in view of the serious character of the Report of the Commission, and the impossibility of the local authority accepting under the Bill duties which the bishops of the Church of England had been unwilling or incapable of discharging.

SIR E. CARSON thought it would be better to leave the word "permit" as carrying the meaning that the local authority was to leave things alone.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he really believed there was no difference between the policy of the Government and the desire of the Opposition in reference to this clause that there should be no change whatever in the schools during the transition period. His noble friend thought the effect of the words in the Bill would be to leave this open to the local authority. Perhaps this would be a convenient moment to ask the Government whether the trustees were to have control over the teachers, and give orders as to the hours when religious teaching should be given, or whether that would be left with the local authority. It might be convenient to have from the right hon. Gentleman a statement of the relations that were to subsist between the two co-ordinate authorities.

MR. BIRRELL said the local authority would have to assume responsibility for the school, taking it over upon certain terms and carrying on the school work. It would be a condition that the local authority should have no option, but should permit religious instruction of the same character as that previously given, and should permit teachers to give that instruction as part of their duty. That clearly indicated that, although it would not be in the power of the trustees or managers to lengthen the time allotted for religious instruction, the local authority would stand by and permit the teachers to give the same religious instruction as had been given heretofore. The only thing of importance was that the local authority was not to interfere with the character of the religious teaching and it was to be of the same kind as it was before and given by the same teachers.

LORD BALCARRES asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD R. CECIL moved to amend subsection (2) in order to provide that the local education authority shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, and so far as practicable, cause the teachers in the school to give religious instruction of the same character as that previously given as part of their duties.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 6, to leave out the word 'permit' and to insert the words 'subject to the provisions of this Act, and so far as practicable, cause.'"

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out to stand part of the Question."

MR. BIRRELL said he preferred the word "permit" to the word "cause" for the reasons he had already given.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said his noble friend had moved an Amendment which raised a very specific question, namely, as to whether the managers or trustees were to be liable to give religious instruction as they were before and would be able to compel the teachers to give religious instruction during the time which they were now compelled to give it. They did not want anything more, but they did want that they should be compelled to do what they had done in the past. The Government had agreed that the managers should not be deprived of their existing machinery for carrying on religious education, but the subsection as it stood did not seem to him to carry out that object. On the other hand, he thought the words proposed in the Amendment were dangerous because they were limiting in their character. He desired that religious education should be given, not according to the provisions of the Bill, but according to what had hitherto taken place.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR asked whether there was any power to appeal or to regulate the character of the religious instruction in these temporarily used voluntary schools. There was a great deal of curiosity on that point.

Dr. MACNAMARA said it appeared to him that they were getting into difficulty with this subsection. It was provided that while a schoolhouse was used under the powers given by this section the same conditions and provisions should apply as where an arrangement was made for the use of a schoolhouse, except that the local education authority should permit this religious instruction to be given. Therefore the present trustees and the managers would disappear, and it appeared to him that they could not under those circumstances compel the teacher to give this religious teaching if he did not wish to do so, because the only provision made was that the local education authority should "permit" the religious instruction given in the school to be of the same character as that previously given.

Mr. BIRRELL said the intention of the clause was that the religion of the school should not be interfered with, and, therefore, the local education authority was put under an obligation to permit the teachers to give religious instruction as heretofore. He hoped the hon. Member for North Camberwell agreed with that.

Dr. MACNAMARA: No, I do not.

Mr. BIRRELL: All I can say is that it is the intention of the clause that the local education authority shall be under an obligation to permit religious instruction of the same character as heretofore to be given.

Mr. A. J. Balfour.

Dr. MACNAMARA: Oh, I thought you said the local authority could compel the teachers to give it.

Mr. BIRRELL: Oh no, there is no power on the part of the local authority to compel the teachers to give religious instruction. The only compulsion is on the local authority to "permit" instruction to be given. The trustees are to be given the power to secure the continuance of the religious teaching in the schools.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said it was admitted by the Government that this religious teaching ought to go on, and that all the local authority had to do was to "permit" it to go on. Who had got the power to compel it?

Dr. MACNAMARA: No one.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that was the real point. The question was whether the managers would have the power to say that between certain times this religious instruction must be given. If they had not that power there was no security that the old system would be carried on. If they had that power, they would be able to see that the religious education was continued. At present the managers had that power, and if it was taken away there would, as he had said, be no security for the continuance of this kind of teaching.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON said the teacher had been engaged to give this religious instruction, and when the school came under the provisions of the Bill the teacher would be paid by the local authority and he was therefore in the service of that body. Could he not take advantage of the clause which said that the teacher was not to be required to give religious instruction? He asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would accept an Amendment to provide that the local education authority should enforce any requirement made by the managers on the teachers in the school to give that religious instruction as part of their duties. The teachers had been engaged by the managers to give this instruction, and, if the managers were displaced by the local authority, the power of the local authority should be brought to bear on the teachers at the instance of the managers.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) did not think the difficulty would be got over by the Amendment suggested. So long as the existing head teacher, who had been appointed to give this definite religious instruction, continued in the school, he could go on giving that instruction if he wished to do so. But, if he was removed and another head teacher arrived, then the question arose who would appoint him, and whether he should be asked whether he would or would not give this religious instruction. That was in the nature of a temporary test. The difficulty might be got over, but he did not think it would be by the words suggested.

MR. BIRRELL thought the difficulty would be got over when they came to consider subsequent Amendments with regard to the appointment of the teacher. He did not know that, during the period the schools were taken over, the foundation managers would be continued. He did not think they would. He had always had it in his mind that the appointment of the teacher would be entirely with the local authority, and one, at all events, of the subsequent Amendments would have to be accepted so as to provide that the local authority, in appointing a new teacher for these schools, would have to make the appointment in connection with the trusts of the schools, just in the same way as the foundation managers would have done if this Act had not been passed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that was most satisfactory as far as it went, but although it solved one difficulty it did not solve all. It would solve the difficulty of the character of the teaching to be given. It would ensure that the teacher would be of the denomination by which the school had been built and carried on, but it traversed the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman a few moments ago that all that was required was to leave these things alone. The clause insisted on the appointment of denominational teachers, and that might be the only way out of the difficulty, although he should have thought it would have been much more simple to have left the managers in the same position as they were in now for the next two years. It might be fair, so far as it went, but it did not settle the question who was to require these teachers to teach religion during this three-quarters of an hour. Who was to say to the teacher, "You shall teach religion, and the religion you shall teach is such and such religion ?" If that was to be the local authority then they came back to the difficulty suggested by the hon. Member for East Toxteth at an earlier stage. If it was not the local authority, was it to be the managers ? The managers were to be abolished. If the managers were abolished the only possible alternative was the trustees. He thought it ought to be left to somebody. Somebody must be responsible for seeing that a teacher who had to give the religious teaching should be qualified to give it.

MR. BIRRELL explained that there would be managers appointed by the local authority, and it would certainly be their duty to see that the statutory obligation that the religious teaching should be the same as heretofore was carried out.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.) said it was obvious that the intention of the Government was that during this transition period the things which did exist already should remain so far as religious instruction was concerned. That appeared to be foreshadowed by the clause, but if there was any doubt the words at the end of the clause, "to give that instruction" might be strengthened by the addition of the words "as part of their duty." It should be part of their duty to give the accustomed religious instruction, and he thought that with that fortification of the section it might be very well left to the managers to fulfil their duty, which was to see that the things which they were accustomed to do before should continue to be done.

DR. MACNAMARA said the difficulty was that the first three lines of this subsection of Clause 10 made these schools "provided schools" subject to the particular form of religion taught in them being continued. What he wished to know was, it being a provided school, whether the teacher of that school would not have the relief granted by Section 7, subsection (2)—that was to say they would not be required as part of their duty to give any religious instruction, or submit to any religious test. He submitted that the whole of these three lines would have to be materially altered.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said he believed the clause aimed at being a continuance of the *status quo ante.* In effect it was not so, nor would the Amendment secure that result. It would have no operation except on a vacancy arising. In the intervening period teachers would not be under any obligation to obey anybody's orders in regard to religious instruction.

Sir W. ROBSON said that this clause was drafted on the assumption that the teachers who had been giving religious instruction would not decline to go on giving that teaching. He thought it was true to say that they would not be bound to give it, but, at the same time, they expected that the teachers would go on as they had heretofore done. The Government were unwilling to go through even the form of putting in words of compulsion, because they believed they would be quite unnecessary.

Mr. R. PEARCE (Staffordshire, Leek) said that the only object of the clause was to enable the local authority to take possession of a school in an area where there was not sufficient school accommodation and to provide for secular instruction. They on the Ministerial side of the House had no sympathy with all this talk of denominational instruction. They could settle the question by substituting the ordinary religious instruction which was to be given in the provided schools, and he hoped the Government would not place any obligation upon the local authority to go beyond permitting religious instruction being given.

Mr. AUSTIN TAYLOR said his right hon. friend was practically putting the local authority in the responsible position that bishops occupied. The obligation for continuing in these schools religious instruction of the same character as had been previously given, rested with the local authority. It rested on the teacher to give the same kind of religious instruction as was given before in the schools; that threw a much more serious responsibility on the local authority than any responsibility that was thrown upon them under Clauses 3 and 4. Under Clause 3 the local authorities only threw open the door of the schools and gave facilities to certain people to give the religious instruction they desired to give. Under Clause 4 it was provided that where four-fifths of the parents desired it that religious instruction should be given; but here the local authority was going to undertake to give the religious teaching. Surely, therefore, it should be of the same character as that previously given. Might he ask his right hon. friend to answer the question as to who was really to settle a case of dispute regarding the character of the religious teaching in these schools?

*Lord R. CECIL, in asking leave to withdraw the Amendment, said he wished the right hon. Gentleman had expressed the view earlier that in order to secure the continuance of denominational teaching, it was necessary to have denominational teachers.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Mr. ASHLEY moved to add at the end of the clause the words, "and the local education authority shall have no power to dismiss teachers except on educational grounds."

Mr. BIRRELL said he could not accept this particular Amendment.

Mr. ASHLEY said perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would accept an Amendment later on. The right hon. Gentleman in a speech he delivered this afternoon had stated that he wished these schools to have the same teachers during the next two or three years. It did not say so in the clause, and though he granted it would seldom happen that they would be dismissed, the Committee ought to guard against eventualities, and put in words at the end of the clause to afford security in this respect.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 8, at the end, to add the words 'And the local education authority shall have no power to dismiss teachers except on educational grounds.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. BIRRELL said he could not accept these words, because they put far too great restrictions upon the power of the local authority. Nor did he think the Amendment at all necessary in order to carry out the general purposes of this clause.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON thought they wanted some security as regarded this matter, and he hoped if the right hon. Gentleman would not accept this Amendment he would give careful consideration to some other Amendment to effect this object.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 152; Noes, 326. (Division List No. 206.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn A. J. (City Lond).
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Fell, Arthur

Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F (Bury S Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir J. H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kilbride, Denis
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt-Col. A. R.
Long, Col, Chas. W. (Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham

Mooney, J. J.
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Redmond, John E (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancash.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)

Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES — Mr. Ashley and Mr. Butcher.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W, Clive
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.

Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)

Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrel, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel

Molteno, Percy Alport
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E.(Edinb'gh,Central)
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt.Hn.E.(Dundee)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers,F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edw. (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J .W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmart'n
Williamson, A.
Wilson,Hon.C.H.W.(Hull,W.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJT(Hud'rs'field
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. ASHLEY, in moving to add at the end of the clause:—"And no teacher shall be appointed by the local education authority, except in accordance with the terms of the trust," said he would not detain the Committee with any remarks, because he understood that the right hon. Gentleman had expressed his willingness to accept this Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 8, at the end, to insert the words 'And no teacher shall be appointed by the local education authority, except in accordance with the terms of the trust.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said these words were rather out of keeping with the earlier part of the clause. Of that there could be no doubt, but he thought the whole Committee would recognise that they were here simply acquiring the temporary use of voluntary schools, and they did so because they wished the local authority to provide sufficient accommodation. If they could not come to terms they might have to build new school premises. He thought justice and equity demanded that they should not do anything during their temporary usage of other people's premises which would interfere with the character of the school when the tenancy ceased. It was essential that they should make a provision that if any vacancy arose in the office of teacher whilst the schoolhouse was being used, the local authority should only appoint a teacher who was willing to give the teaching of the denomination, whatever it might be, to which that school belonged. He thought that was only a fair and just proposal. He did not know that the words proposed by the hon. Member opposite were the best for that purpose, and he would suggest the following—

> "And if a vacancy arises in the office of teacher, while the schoolhouse is used under this section, the local education authority shall, in choosing the teacher, appoint a teacher who is willing to give the religious instruction required under this section."

Those words would secure that the local education authority would be obliged to appoint a teacher who was willing to give the religious instruction in accordance with the denominational character of the school. Having regard to the nature of the bargain there was the possibility that the local education authority would never acquire the school and they might build others. He thought it would be clearly wrong to do anything which would break up or interfere with the religious continuity of the school.

MR. ASHLEY said that after the liberal way in which he had been met, he would withdraw his Amendment and accept the words the right hon. Gentleman had suggested.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 7, line 8, at end, to insert the words 'and if a vacancy arises in the office of teacher while the schoolhouse is used under this section, the local education authority shall, in choosing the teacher, appoint a teacher who is willing to give the religious instruction required under this section."'—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said he most earnestly protested against this concession which the Minister for Education had made. He and other Members on the Ministerial side of the House had noticed with some concern during the passage of the Bill the concessions made in the direction of the sectarian schools repeatedly whittling away some of the advantages in the opposite direction which they thought they were entitled to look for from the Government. If he understood the new provision correctly it would, in villages especially, enable the Church of England or the National Society to hold possession of the village schools for two years during the whole of which time they might be negotiating with the local authority; and during that period they would have control of the school and practically control of the appointment of teachers. Owing to an Amendment accepted earlier in the day the period of one year which would have compelled the voluntary schools to have quickly come to terms had been extended so that two years were now given for these negotiations. If he was wrong in that interpretation he should be glad to be set right. That meant that the Church of England or the National Society would have absolute control for two years of the national schools in the villages, which they had fondly hoped would have immediately come under the control of the local educational authority. There was also another singular result of this concession. The Bill was intended to unify education and to provide all through the country schools under popular control and free from sectarian tests. Those were the two principles for which many Members fought very hard at the recent election. Under the late Education Act two types of schools were created, but the present Bill provided five types of schools, and this new proposal provided a sixth—a transition type of school under which there would be all the objectionable features of the imposition of sectarian tests upon teachers.

MR. BIRRELL: There is no need to take it over.

MR. PERKS replied that that was exactly his grievance; he wished to take it. ["Oh."] He was not surprised at this outburst from Members on the Opposition side of the House. Those hon. Members knew what they wanted, and that was to have control of the sectarian schools. He was supremely anxious that these schools at the earliest possible moment, especially in the villages, should be freed from sectarian and denominational control.

DR. MACNAMARA said his hon. friend the Member for Louth did not appear to recognise that these schools were to be taken over without any payment during the transition period. The object was to carry them on for a period of two years under the schemes of 1902. He was sorry they had to carry on the Act of 1902 in these respects, but they could do nothing else just now while the negotiations were proceeding. If his right hon. friend honestly desired to carry on things as they were in cases where no agreement had been arrived at he was bound to recast the clause, and especially the first three lines of it. With regard to the Amendment of the President of the Board of Education, the spirit of which he entirely accepted, he admitted that they must carry on the 1902 arrangement for a short period, but thought the present proposal went a little beyond that arrangement. The arrangement only required the trustees in the matter of appointments to have the head teacher of the denomination to which the school belonged.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said his recollection of the 1902 arrangement was that the appointment of teachers was to be left to the managers of the schools, subject to the veto of the local education authority on secular grounds. But the managers were not obliged to appoint any of the teachers of the school according to the religion of the denomination to which the school belonged.

DR. MACNAMARA said he was prepared to have that arrangement during the whole of the time which elapsed before an agreement was arrived at. This Amendment subjected every teacher in the transferred schools to the religious test. It was to the credit of the Leader of the Opposition that he freed the pupil teacher and the assistant teacher from a denominational test.

SIR W. ROBSON dissented.

DR. MACNAMARA: The Solicitor-General shakes his head.

SIR W. ROBSON said under the Act of 1902 the managers were not bound to appoint the under-teachers of the same denomination, but it was to be assumed that they generally appointed under-teachers of the same denomination.

DR. MACNAMARA said that under the proposed Amendment there would not be any assumption at all. He appealed to the Government to carry out the letter and the spirit of the 1902 arrangement. He thought they might fairly ask that if they subjected the head teacher to a religious test for the period to which he had alluded they should free the pupil teacher and the assistant teacher. In his opinion they were bound to carry out the spirit of the 1902 arrangement with the school with which no agreement had been made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that under the Act of 1902 the denominational majority of managers had what he understood the Government had not made up their minds to give, namely, the power of requiring that the teachers appointed should carry on religious teaching in the school. He had requested the Government to carry the 1902 scheme in that most important and essential particular into their new system, but so far he could not honestly say that he had received more than generalities. He had asked the Government to embody these generalities in specific words, but he had not yet got them to do it. He asked the Committee not to think even with the concession of the Government these schools would, from the denominational point of view, be under the 1902 standard and not above it.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey) complained that concession after concession, night after night, was made by the Minister for Education to the Opposition. [Cries of "No, no."] At any rate, hon. Gentlemen opposite had been very strong in their praise of the right hon. Gentleman, and they praised him because he satisfied them. The right hon. Gentleman ought to limit his concession to the head teacher.

MR. BIRRELL said the word "concession" was constantly being used—he did not think in the very exact meaning of the word. An important concession would be a departure from the principle of the Bill as introduced. Surely they could not say it was a concession if the Minister in charge of a Bill, doing his duty as best he could under somewhat difficult circumstances, endeavoured to make the meaning of the Government perfectly intelligible and did so in good faith. The Amendment only carried out the intention of the clause, no more and no less, and he disputed the statement that it was a concession. In a deliberative assembly, when an argument was presented and they felt the force of it, they had to give attention to it. If they felt a point had been made they had to regard it wholly irrespective of the majority they might command in the lobbies. Otherwise they would cease to be a deliberative assembly. Of course, he would much sooner have the support of his own side than that of hon. Gentlemen opposite, but when a good point was made which showed that amendment was called for in order to carry out the expressed intentions of the Government, he saw no shame in accepting it.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) said the President of the Board of Education in this particular matter was going further than was required by the circumstances of the case. He was one of those who desired to consider the matter in a fair and business spirit. He understood that it was the intention of the Government that the school should be carried on upon the same terms, and in the same way, as it was now being carried on. The condition applying to the school at present was that no teacher, except the head teacher, should be required to give religious instruction as part of his duties. The Amendment of the Minister for Education proposed to go far beyond that, because it required all the teachers in the school to give religious instruction. He ventured to think that that was going unnecessarily beyond the existing system, or what was required to fulfil the desire of the Government. He was unable to assent to the Amendment unless the Minister was willing to limit it to the head teacher.

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmorland, Applyby) said he agreed with the Minister for Education that a point made by those on the opposite side of the House might be good, but a point made by those on the Ministerial side might also be good. He thought the point that the religious test should be limited to the head teacher was a good point. The Amendment of the President of the Board of Education went beyond what was reasonable. Under the 1902 Act the managers of provided schools were allowed to appoint sub-teachers without regard to the denominations to which the schools were attached. But under the Amendment, as he understood it, if an under-teacher was removed, a successor would have to be appointed belonging to the denomination to which the school was attached, so that in that case the denominational test for teachers would be again applied. He submitted that that went far beyond the necessities of the case and might injuriously affect the whole teaching staff of a school.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton) said he should vote against this Amendment in any shape or form, because it went against the whole principle and spirit of the Bill. It would cause the local education authority to impose a religious test on teachers, which they did not even have to do under the deplorable Act of 1902.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 369; Noes, 51. (Divisional List No. 207).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, RtHn.SirAlexF.
Adkins, W Ryland
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Asquith, RtHn. HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt.Hn.Sir H.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn.A.J. (City Lond.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight

Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cawley, Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Dobson, Thomas W.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Gov'n
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Haddock, George R.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Heaton, John Henniker
Hedges, A. Paget
Helmsley, Viscount
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds
Higham, John Sharp
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hunt, Rowland
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Lewis, John Herbert
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lough, Thomas
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Crae, George
M'Iver Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Micklem, Nathaniel
Middlemore John Throgmorton
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morpeth, Viscount

Morrell, Philip
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts., Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shee, James John
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Philipps, J. Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Major Leslie
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann Sir, C. E. (Manchester
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Starkey, John R.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wodehouse, Lord(Norfolk, Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Barnes, G. N.
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Brace, William
Clynes, J. R.
Crooks, William
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Fell, Arthur
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardie, J. Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Nicholls, George
Parker, James (Halifax)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe
Walsh, Stephen
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, George (Norfolk)
Williams, Llewellyn(Carmathen
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Ellis Griffith and Mr. Clough.

MR. GARDNER (Berkshire, Wokingham) stated that under a misapprehension he voted in the wrong lobby.

SIR E. CARSON moved to insert at the end of the words last inserted—

> "Clause 6 of this Act shall not apply while the schoolhouse is used under this section."

The object of the Amendment was merely to make clear what the right hon. Gentleman stated in the earlier part of the discussion to the effect that it would be unwise to interrupt the facilities for religious teaching during the time the school was in this transition state. Clause 6 enacted that the parent of a child attending a public elementary school should not be under any obligation to cause the child to attend at the schoolhouse except during the times allotted in the time-table exclusively to secular instruction. That enabled parents to withdraw their children during the hours of religious instruction. There was some division of opinion about the clause when it was discussed, and as the right hon. Gentleman said he did not wish any interference with religious instruction in the schools now under discussion, he did not think he could have any objection to this Amendment which simply provided that during the transition period the instruction should be continued.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 8, after the words last inserted, to insert the words, 'Section 6 of this Act shall not apply while a schoolhouse is used under this section.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR W. ROBSON did not think the right hon. and learned Gentleman correctly stated the effect of what his right hon. friend had said, which was that he did not wish to interfere with facilities for religious instruction in these temporary schools. The right hon. and learned Gentleman went by his Amendment a good deal further than his right hon. friend's words, or any reasonable meaning to be attached to them. Why should not Clause 6 apply to these schools? No difficulty had existed in the past, and he did not believe that a single summons had been issued to compel a child to attend during the time of religious instruction. The compulsion had only been applied in regard to secular instruction. There was no necessity for compulsion now, especially as the local education authority only held these schools for two years, which period might be reduced by agreement. It was therefore very undesirable to make a different rule between these schools and other schools.

LORD R. CECIL failed to follow the argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman. He did not know whether he thought that Clause 6 had any meaning or not. He understood that the Government desired to keep these schools *in status quo* during the transition period. If that was their desire did Clause 6 make any difference at all?

SIR W. ROBSON said that religious instruction would go on in the same way without compulsion.

LORD R. CECIL wanted to know whether that was understood. The Solicitor-General had argued that there was no compulsion at the present time, and also that Clause 6 made no alteration. If that was so, why was it in the Bill at all? In his view, if denominational teaching was to continue in these particular schools they must be freed from Clause 6. The attitude of the Government over that clause was not very reasonable, and it was because they dared not face the fury of their Nonconformist supporters a second time that they did not assent to this alteration. Although they were a Government full of courage, and 'master in their own house', they declined to grant an Amendment which he ventured to say no other Government would have refused.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) asked why if Clause 6 was absolutely innocuous the Government refused to accept the Amendment. For himself he believed that clause to be most harmful and mischievous, and therefore he supported the Amendment. He hoped that clause, which was most objectionable, would be used on every platform in the country against the Government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said there was a certain want of lucidity about the Solicitor-General's argument. Indeed he made two excellent speeches which were contradictory. He had asked what was the use of using compulsion when it was never applied. If that argument had any meaning at all it meant that Clause 6 was innocuous. But why did the Government introduce it into the Bill if that was so? He could not see why the Government could not accept the Amendment which dealt with a state of things which were identical in regard to these schools both before and after Clause 6 was passed. It would be remembered that the Government left Clause 6 to the House, which showed that they thought the less they had to do with it the better for them. If there was any argument, as there certainly was, for leaving Clause 6 to the Committee, there was certainly a stronger argument for leaving this Amendment to the Committee. The whole position of the Government was that these schools were to remain as they were. If that was so they ought to be allowed to remain under the law as it was before Clause 6 was passed. Even if Clause 6 was popular with the Government and the House there would be a strong ground for not applying it to these interim schools. But when they found a difference of opinion in the Government upon it; when they found members of the Government voting against that clause, and when they found the Amendment to the clause rejected by a majority of only sixteen, in that condition of affairs surely the practice the Government had deliberately adopted in that case should be adopted in the case of the present Amendment. The anomaly would not last for more than two years. Let the hon. and learned Gentleman consistently carry out the ideas of his own Government and make the system of these schools conform as near as possible to the system suggested in the Amendment. If he could not accept the suggestion let the Committee remain free to say for itself whether Clause 6 should apply to these schools.

DR. MACNAMARA said that in his opinion the merits of Clause 6 did not arise. The intention of the Government was to continue these schools during this short period as under the Act of 1902. The difficulty arose owing to these schools being provided schools. If the first three lines of the Clause remained, not only would the Amendment which had been moved exclude these schools from Clause 6, but other Amendments would exclude them from Clause 7. What was wanted was the introduction of words which would in terms continue these schools as under the Act of 1902. He thought the clause should be recast. The sooner that that was expressed in terms the better for the schools.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said this clause affected the rural districts far more than the urban districts, and he therefore urged the Government not to yield on this point. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had over and over again admitted that the position occupied by these schools under the Act of 1902 was very unfair and anomalous. That being so why should they continue it a moment longer than necessary? This was one of the exceptions that they should remove with the least possible delay. He hoped the Government would resist the Amendment.

*MR. LEIF JONES said he could not see that they had really been landed in the great difficulty suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition with regard to this Amendment. The idea of the Government was to carry on these schools in such a way that no injury would be done to them if the owners decided to carry them on themselves hereafter. And no harm would be done to them by setting up at once the permanent arrangement under which they would have to be carried on at the end of the two years. No real grievance could be alleged by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite owing to there being no official to secure the attendance of the children at the religious instruction. The effect of the section would be that a system would be set up at once which would in any case be the permanent system of the school at the end of two years. He could not see that any harm would be done by this procedure.

MR. BRIDGEMAN said the hon. Member for N.W. Norfolk had directly invited the Government to break the pledge given by the President of the Board of Education earlier in the day, and therefore the Committee ought to hear from a representative of the Government either that they were going to keep the pledge given, or some argument from them to show that this was not a breach of it. When debating a previous Amendment the right hon. Gentleman told the Committee they ought not to ask for any payment on the ground that the Church schools were going to be carried on in the same way as they had hitherto been carried on, and everything the Church people held dear in the teaching was to be preserved during the time this clause was in operation. It had now been pointed out that what they regarded as most important was going to be taken away, and so far from leaving the schools in the same position as they were before the introduction of this Bill, they would be placed in a much worse position. The Government must recognise that if they did not accept this Amendment they would break the pledge which the right hon. Gentleman gave earlier in the afternoon.

LORD MORPETH said that Clause 6 was the most uneducational clause of the most uneducational Bill introduced into this House during the last thirty years. Under this clause three-quarters of an hour a day was going to be lost to thousands of the children of the country. He supported the Amendment because if it was carried that time would be saved. It was of the greatest importance in his opinion that a contrast should be set up in order that the country should have an opportunity of seeing the working of the schools under Clause 6 as compared with the working of the other schools. They would then see that Clause 6 was uneducational, reactionary, and bad.

LORD BALCARRES said the hon. Member for N.W. Norfolk objected to this Amendment on grounds which were incompatible with the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education. So far as the Committee was concerned, everybody accepted the statement that the object of the clause was to put the suspensory schools during the two or three years of transition in precisely the same conditions as they were now under. The President of the Board of Education had said it would be a gross injustice to alter the continuity of religious instruction in these schools, on the ground that in two or three years from now they might be taken over by the local education authority on the one hand, or else that the local education authority might say that they found they could get on better with new schools and that they would not take over these schools. Whether they agreed with the Bill or not they must admit that that was a reasonable line to take up. The Government supported the last Amendment on the ground that it avowedly was to keep the schools in the position they now occupied, and that being so, it was not possible on logical grounds to decline to accept this Amendment. He had gathered from the observations of some hon. Gentlemen that Clause 6 was inoperative; that Clause 6 being passed, these schools would not thereby be affected. He was unable to understand that, because Clause 6 was obviously put in the Bill for some purpose. The object of this clause being to maintain the schools in precisely the position they now occupied he could not understand why the Government should exclude from the provisions of Clause 10 the Clause 6 schools.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH thought it was only fitting that they should have a clear reason why the Government opposed this Amendment, and some further explanation ought to be given by someone more closely connected with the Department of Education. It was true that Clause 6 had been discussed, but not fully, and that was the case with a good many other clauses in the Bill. Clause 6 aimed at the religious education of the country, and would strike out religion from the schools. He hoped the Parliamentary Secretary would see his way to give a clear indication of the views of the Government with regard to the reasons why they would not accept the Amendment.

MR. NAPIER (Kent, Faversham) said that although he was strongly opposed to Clause 6 he could not vote for the Amendment. The clause had nothing to do with the schools; it was concerned with the parents. When one was establishing a general law affecting people, how was it possible to except from its scope parents who might send their children to a particular school?

SIR E. CARSON said the extraordinary speech to which they had just listened necessitated some observations. He failed to follow the frame of mind of the hon. Member for Faversham, who said that he was opposed to Clause 6 and yet desired that it should be applied to the particular schools dealt with in that clause, but not to the State schools. This meant that the hon. Member considered that Clause 6 was harmful in the permanent system of the country, but not harmful in the case now under consideration. That was a frame of mind which resulted from the conscience of the hon. Member on a previous occasion having got a holiday and not having a holiday on this occasion. The distinction which the hon. Member had drawn that Clause 6 applied to parents and not to schools could not be maintained. When parents had once been encouraged not to send their children during the hours of religious instruction, it would be impossible to restore them to the frame of mind in which they regarded it as part of their duty to insist on their children's attendance. If the policy announced as the policy of the Government by the President of the Board of Education was to be carried out the Amendment ought to be accepted. If it was not carried out, it would be practically a breach of faith.

SIR W. ROBSON said there never was a charge put forward upon less foundation than that which had just been made. No man in the House was less likely than the President of the Board of Education to commit a breach of faith. Was it to be supposed that to withdraw compulsion would break the continuity of religious teaching? He did not think so ill of religious teaching in the denominational schools and of the parents who sent their children to them as to believe that that would be the result. How unjust that accusation was would be seen when they considered what the right hon. Gentleman was speaking of at the time. He was dealing with the very question of the temporary continuity of religious instruction which he said he did not desire to break. He did not say that there was going to be no change whatever in the condition of the schools during the operation of this clause. Members of the Opposition ought to be a little more careful before using such phrases as a "breach of faith"; such accusations ought not to be made recklessly.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) thought the Government ought to accept the Amendment. If the Bill failed to satisfy the expectations of its best friends it would be almost entirely because of Clause 6. To say that there should be religious teaching, but that that teaching was of so little importance that it need not necessarily be given, was to insult the feelings of a great many people. A child would be compelled by law to attend geography lessons and learn where Birmingham was, for instance, but when any one wanted to teach him anything about Heaven he might stay in bed and not go to school. This was simply turning religious teaching into ridicule, and it would be far better to say that there should be no religious teaching at all. He thought it would be found that in future the real opposition of this Bill would centre round Clause 6, and in order to mitigate that danger he urged the Government to make a small concession by agreeing to the proposal that Clause 6 should not be operative in the case of these schools.

*MR. COMPTON RICKETT (Yorkshire, W.R., Osgoldcross) said the Government by the introduction of Clause 6 into the Bill had merely tabulated and made law that which had grown to be customary. Why then should the Committee accept the Amendment, especially as this privilege of compulsion could only continue for a matter of two years? After the end of that time the schools would either lapse into private certificated schools or become public schools under the operation of the general law. No doubt in some parishes there would be little ground for complaint, but in many parishes of England there was a number of parents that dared not use the conscience clause, and he did not think it was desirable that either Party in the House should continue the form of compulsion for even two years longer. If the Amendment were adopted, it would be known throughout the country that compulsion might be safely disregarded. After a period of disuse, would any hon. Member opposite suggest that a compulsory attendance upon the religious lesson could be put in force? If it could never become operative, surely the Opposition did not desire to retain a mere bogey by means of which to effect their end! It was better that hon. Gentlemen opposite should rely upon those numerous parents who had sent petitions to every member of the House assuring him of their fidelity to the schools and of their passion for religious education. Hon. Members on the Ministerial side had treated these petitioners seriously. If that were so, parents could be depended upon to send their children to the denominational school for their catechism.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said this was a question of extreme importance. The real point was not so much that which had been raised as whether there should be any alteration in regard to the schools during the temporary period. They all wanted the children in the schools to receive religious instruction, but if the arrangement suggested was made there was a likelihood that those facilities would not be real in the future, because many of the children would get into the habit of not attending the school during the time of religious instruction. It was difficult to see under this Bill how 80 per cent. of the parents of the children would be likely to vote for facilities being granted.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY said it would appear rather extraordinary in the country if the Government now refused to accept the Amendment and thereby made Clause 6 obligatory, when they had not even sufficient affection for that clause when it was before the Committee to make it a Government question. A distinct pledge had been given by the Minister in charge of the Bill that religious instruction should be given exactly as before in the schools during the two years of transition. It was on that ground, and on that ground alone, that the right hon. Gentleman had resisted the Amendment dealing with that particular point. It was extraordinary to be asked to break the pledge without a word of explanation on the subject. While the right hon. Gentleman was temporarily absent from the House the Parliamentary Secretary sat in his place in Sphinx-like silence, and nothing would induce him to answer the point raised by his hon. friend. He appealed to the Minister of Education now that he had returned to his seat, to give some further explanation of what he proposed to do on the subject.

*MR. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster) said that hon. Members who were needlessly holding the Minister of Education to his words must certainly admit that his promise did not go further than the appointment of teacher. They were now asking that school attendance officers should be employed to compel the children to attend these schools at an hour when sectarian teaching would be given, although the Committee had decided to alter the whole system of compulsory attendance by Clause 6, which would be frustrated if this proposal became law. Supposing even that Clause 6 was struck out of the Bill in another place—did anyone suppose that the House of Commons would in future allow the schools to be conducted without a stringent conscience clause—absolutely operative?—the want of this had been the cause of all the mischief in the past. He did not think hon. Members on the Opposition side were justified in making such a charge against the right hon. Gentleman as they did—and he held that officers should not be compelled so to act in respect to schools which might or might not in a few months be handed over—in matters of conscience they should not be exceptionally treated.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON, who was received with cries of "Divide, divide," pointed out that the duty of the school attendance officer was to secure that the attendance was such as to obtain the Parliamentary grant, and, as no Parliamentary grant was given for religious instruction, he had to see that the children attended school during the hours devoted to secular instruction.

MR. COMPTON RICKETT: Where does the compulsion come in?

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said the local authority determined by by-law the time during which the children were to attend school and that included the time devoted to religious instruction. Whether Cowper-Temple or denominational instruction was given the children would still be liable to attend, or else they would lose prizes, or be liable to punishment for unpunctuality. The matter was entirely under the control of the local authority, and there was no compulsion except the desire of the parent that the child should be punctual and of the child to avoid the penalties of unpunctuality. The objection to Clause 6 was that, so far from stereotyping the existing practice, it ostentatiously announced that, in the view of this Parliament and of the Government, it was rather undesirable that children should be present during religious instruction. Clause 6 did create the impression that parents were invited to keep their children away from school during the time devoted to religious instruction. It had been promised that during the time which would intervene before an arrangement was made, or a scheme obtained, the school would be conducted precisely as it would have been if it had remained a voluntary school. That could not be if the children were invited to stay away during the time of religious instruction. He thought there was strong reason for asking that it should be explicitly stated that Clause 6 should not apply to those schools which were, as it were, in a state of suspended animation, during which they were to remain precisely as before the Bill was introduced.

Mr. MIDDLEMORE (Birmingham, N.)—(who was received with cries of "Divide")—said he had not intervened often in the debates on this Bill. When he had done so he had been treated with some amount of rudeness, and he would rise on this occasion if only to make a protest against the less than courteous interruptions which were made when his hon. friend the Member for Oxford University rose. This was an Amendment of very great moment indeed, and it ought not to be slurred over. Unless it were carried, thousands of children who had been in the habit of attending religious instruction would cease to do so, and the whole tone of the schools would be altered. The continuity of the teaching would be broken, and the pledge given by the Minister for Education would not be fulfilled. They could not treat religion as an indifferent matter.

Question put.

Committee divided:—Ayes, 110; Noes, 258. (Division List No. 208).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burke, E. Haviland-
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay(Galw'y
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Fell, Arthur
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinb'gh,W.)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meagher, Michael
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mooney, J. J.
Murphy, John
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John

Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Remnant and Mr. Burdett-Coutts.

NOES.

Adkins, W. Ryland
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Baker Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N. E.)
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, J. D. W.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Corbett, C H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davis, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (S. Pancras, N.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral).
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William

Philipps, Col. Ivor(S'thampton
Philipps, J. Wynford(Pembroke
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset E.
Torrance, A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White George (Norfolk)
White, J. D.(Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn(C'rm'rth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wison, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord(Norfolk, Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) moved an Amendment providing that the local education authority should pay the salaries of the teachers during the whole time that the school was open, including the time set apart for religious instruction. He said the object of the Amendment was to attain what, he thought, the Minister of Education would agree were essential points. First of all, it would give clearness of language and thus make it possible to understand exactly what they were doing. The principle involved was a very simple one, but it was perfectly clear that they should come to an understanding upon it, and that it should not be left to the interchange of assurances on one side or the other which were sure to result in charges, naturally resented on both sides, of bad faith. The conditions which regulated the occupation of these schools were to be in force from the beginning of the year 1908, possibly to the end of the year 1909, and during that interval the position of those schools would have an important and lasting effect on the education of the country. They had the assurance that there would be repeated in all respects in those schools the course, the complexion, the style and colour of the education which had hitherto been given in them. No one would contradict him in saying that from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman they had arrived at a perfectly clear understanding on that point. But misunderstandings might easily arise, as had been shown by the hon. Member for North Camberwell, who spoke with so much knowledge and experience, and who had shown that in regard to Clause 2 the interpretation thereof had been made by some hon. Members in an entirely different sense from that of the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education. And he was obliged to say that his reading of the clause, before he heard the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman, agreed with that of the hon. Member for North Camberwell.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that if the hon. Member would look at the Amendment he would see that the question before the Committee was that the salaries of the teachers should be paid by the local education authorities.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said that he did not intend to go beyond the point raised by the Amendment. What he wanted was to make it explicit that the payment of the teachers in respect of religious education should be made perfectly clear.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Member was making a Second Reading speech on the question of religious instruction, and was therefore out of order.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said that with all respect he had simply referred to the necessity of perfect clearness as to the guarantees which were to be given for the carrying on of those schools as heretofore.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said that the guarantees had nothing to do with the Amendment before the Committee, which referred simply to whether the salaries of the teachers during the time the school was open should be paid by the local authority or not.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said that he would not refer any further to that point, since it seemed to the Deputy-Chairman that he was travelling out of order. But they had been told that afternoon by the Minister for Education that certain things would be secured to denominationalists by this clause with regard to the two years' existence of these schools. His object was to put in the clause not a vague understanding but something definite in black and white. That was the reason for his Amendment, and he urged on the right hon. Gentleman the extreme necessity there was to be perfectly definite as to the provisions of the Bill.

THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said he really called the hon. Gentleman's attention to the fact that he was travelling far beyond the limits of his Amendment, which was that the salaries of the teachers should be paid by the local education authority, and by no one else.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said that it would not do to trust to the local education authorities to provide for the payment of the salaries of the teachers as long as the schools were open. The Solicitor-General had said that they must trust the local education authorities, while the hon. Member for Leek said that they ought not to have any understanding at all on the matter. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman if he did not think that a clear and definite understanding as to the payment of salaries ought to be put into this clause of the Bill, otherwise the salaries of the teachers might be reduced. Had they any security that the local education authorities, which the Solicitor-General said they should trust, would not follow the example of the education authority of the West Riding of Yorkshire? It was for the sake of the President of the Board of Education himself that he thought his Amendment should be adopted, because when the right hon. Gentleman had given not a concession, but a clear interpretation of his own Bill, he had been told by hon. Gentlemen behind him that he was giving away the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"To add after the words last inserted in line 8, the words 'while the schoolhouse is so used the local education authority shall pay the salaries of the teachers during the whole time the school is open, including the time set apart for religious instruction.'"—(*Sir Henry Craik.*)

Question proposed, "That these words be there added."

MR. BIRRELL said that this Amendment was absolutely unnecessary. The salaries of the teachers would be paid by the local education authority as heretofore. He described as unfair the references that had been made to the case of the West Riding of Yorkshire. The West Riding of Yorkshire, acting under legal advice, was told that it was justified in taking a particular line of action on a construction of the Act of 1902. He was advised that the legal advice given to the West Riding County Council was wrong. The matter went into Court, and the Judges agreed with his advisers rather than with those of the county council. The council immediately assented to the decision of the Court and had expressed their willingness to abide by it and had intimated that they did not intend to carry the matter any further. He saw no reason why that matter should be brought against the West Riding County Council, unless it was a crime to act upon counsel's opinion. The salaries of these teachers would be paid by the local education authority.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON was quite sure that his hon. friend in introducing this Amendment had no more desire than he had to cast any reflection upon the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire. It was a body with whom he had had a good many differences while he was at the Education Department, but it was a body for whom he had a regard owing to the efforts which it had made to improve the secondary education in its area. All that his hon. friend and all that those on the Opposition side of the House desired, was that the meaning of this subsection should be made perfectly clear in the Bill itself. He thought there might be greater difficulties in regard to the construction of this clause than there were in regard to the Act of 1902, the wording of which had led the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire into the position which they took up. In view of the provisions of Clause 6, which put religious instruction out of school hours, and of Clauses 3 and 4, which excluded the teacher from giving denominational religious teaching in the school, there would be greater difficulty in regard to this Bill than there was in regard to its predecessor, and all he wished was that the meaning should be clearly expressed so that no other deserving local authority might be led by counsel's opinion into the trap into which the West Riding County Council no doubt unwittingly fell. For himself he did not cast any slur upon that county council.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Haldane, Haddington): You menaced them.

*Sir WILLIAM ANSON: I make no complaint in regard to this particular matter, although I had many differences with them. The hon. Baronet went on to say that although there were other matters in regard to which he attached blame to this county council, yet in this particular matter he recognised that all they had done was to act upon a view of the law which was wrong. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would let them know clearly what his view of the construction of the clause was, because for his part he could not see any reason for his refusal to accept the Amendment of his hon. friend, and put in black and white what was his expressed intention.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said that as a member of this much maligned local authority, he thought it had been extremely hardly treated. The right hon. Gentleman had in effect alluded to it as being a poor thing which was misled by its legal advisers. He thought they all ought to sympathise with it on that ground. He did not think it was a slur upon its moral character that it was so misled, and everybody admitted that the council acted honestly, in good faith and from conscientious motives. They were mistaken and wrong, but they acted with the intention of carrying out what they believed to be right. At the same time, speaking on behalf of a great many poor teachers in the West Riding of Yorkshire, he must say that this mistaken action had resulted in inflicting quite unnecessary hardship upon a great many poor teachers. It was, therefore, important that this matter should be put right and that such a proceeding should not be possible in the future. In endeavouring to carry out a propaganda involving sectarian strife, this body inflicted a great injury upon people who could ill afford the money of which they were deprived. Although he believed the county council were conscientious, he thought the Committee should do their best to prevent the recurrence of such an incident, and that his hon. friend was justified in raising the question. He welcomed the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman that it was impossible for such a proceeding to happen again in the future.

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said there was not the slightest doubt that they were all agreed upon the meaning which it was intended should be placed upon this subsection, and that was that the local education authority should pay the teachers their full salaries. The words which created a doubt, however, were those which provided that while a schoolhouse was used under the section "the same conditions and provisions shall apply under this Act as where an arrangement is made for the use of a schoolhouse." If those words were read strictly, there was not the slightest doubt that the managers of the schoolhouse and not the local education authority would have to pay the teachers for the religious instruction given during school hours. As the words of the section were capable of the construction put upon them by the mover of the Amendment, was there, he asked, any harm in accepting his words.

LORD HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said the speech made by the right hon. Gentleman was the strongest justification for the Amendment. If a powerful local body took up a strong position it would be difficult to deal with this matter, and it was important that no room should be left for misconception or misinterpretation. The reason why the Amendment was not to be accepted seemed to be that it would lay the right hon. Gentleman open to the charge of giving a concession to the Opposition. The Amendment was purely a verbal one, and he could not see why if these salaries were to be paid by the local authority it should not be stated in the Bill. Considering that the people who had to construe and act upon these Acts of Parliament had not the opportunity of availing themselves of the facilities for interpreting them which were at the disposal of the right hon. Gentleman, he thought it would be far better to put these words in, so that there should not be such a fiasco as there was under the Act of 1902 of a local authority taking up a position and having to be put right by a Court of law. Would the right hon. Gentleman assure them that the salaries would be paid by the local authority?

*SIR HENRY CRAIK said he would withdraw his Amendment if the right hon. Gentleman assured him that it was unnecessary and impliedly contained in the Bill.

MR. BIRRELL: Salaries are paid by the local authority.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that to say that the salaries were paid by the local authority was no doubt to state what was indisputable. There was no doubt that the payments which the teachers would get would be paid by the local authority. What they wanted to know was whether the salaries covered the whole time that the school was open. What they wanted to know was whether the teachers would get what they were entitled to, or would the provisions be such as would give rise to the difference of opinion and the loss of time in recovering the amounts due to them, which had arisen in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (Mr. CALDWELL, Lanarkshire, Mid.) proceeded to put the Question.

LORD HELMSLEY asked whether they were to have an answer from the Government?

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN said as there was no answer he had put the Question.

MR. BIRRELL: I have answered.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London) said the right hon. Gentleman had always been distinguished for his courteous behaviour, and he would ask him whether it was courteous to refuse an answer?

MR. BIRRELL: I have given the answer again and again.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON: If the right hon. Gentleman would give an answer, we might be spared the necessity for a division. Hon. Members will not allow us either to speak or to listen.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) asked whether it was in order for the hon. Gentleman to say the Committee would not listen to him when he had already spoken four times.

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN then put the Amendment, not observing Lord R. Cecil, who had risen, and who continued to stand, amid loud cries of "Answer," "Order," "Name," and Opposition cheers.

Lord R. CECIL protested against the action of the Deputy-Chairman. ["Order."]

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: I had put the Question.

While the Committee proceeded to a division,

Lord R. CECIL, seated and with his hat on, said: I do not think this kind of way of conducting business is likely to conduce—[Cries of "Name," "Withdraw," and Opposition cheers.]

*The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: I put the question for the second time after it was obvious that no further answer was to be given, and I did not observe anyone rise.

Lord R. CECIL: You would not look.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 65; Noes, 333. (Division List No. 209.)

AYES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H.T.(Londonderry,N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson,Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E.Feetham(Lewisham)
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.Sir John H.
King, Sir Henry Seymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long,Rt. Hn. Walter(Dublin,S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Nield, Herbert
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker,Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A.Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black ,Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, T.D.(Derbyshire,N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-

Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, Joseph John
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W.Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John. W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazelton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, W.)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down, S.)
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor,James (Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Mara, James
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce,Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price, RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.

Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse,Lord(Norfolk,Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

LORD R. CECIL rose to a point of order, and asked the Deputy-Chairman what was the proper course for him to follow under circumstances that had arisen before the division——

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN (interposing): That incident is closed. The Question now before the Committee is that Clause 10 as amended stand part of the Bill.

LORD R. CECIL, who was received with loud Ministerial cries of "Order, order," and "Sit down," said he claimed he was entitled to speak on a point of order. He understood that the Deputy-Chairman had ruled that it was impossible for him to raise any question in connection with what had just occurred.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is impossible to raise it now. the incident having been done with.

SIR E. CARSON: When would it be possible to raise it?

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: It is not for me to advise; it is for hon. Members to find that out for themselves. We must proceed with the Bill. I therefore put the question that Clause 10 as amended stand part of the Bill.

DR. MACNAMARA said he wished to call the attention of the President of the Board of Education to the fact that at the close of sub-section (2), in order to give effect to his own desire that the schools should be continued on the 1902 conditions, he added words to the effect that if a vacancy arose the local authority should say that the teacher appointed should be one who would give the religious teaching which had been given in the school in the past. He thought his right hon. friend however should confine the addition to the head teachers, and should not have brought in the assistant teachers and pupil teachers for submission to any religious test upon appointment. He hoped on the Report stage his right hon. friend would see that the clause did carry out that in which they were all agreed, namely, that this should be a provisional scheme under which schools could be continued for a short period as they were under the 1902 Act. Would his right hon. friend bring the Amendment he had made absolutely into accord with the provisions of Section 7, subsection (5), of the Act of 1902, which did remove assistant and pupil teachers from the necessity of submitting to any religious test on their appointment?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought the hon. Gentleman had failed to remember some considerations which would perhaps modify his views. His account of the Act of 1902 was perfectly accurate, but the persons in whose judgment the discretion was left absolutely by *the* Act were the managers of the schools, a majority of whom were of the same denomination as the school of which they were managers. What the hon. Member for North Camberwell, or the Government under his guidance, must do, was to bring in a clause under which the managers would be left with the power of appointing the head teacher and the under teachers, and with the power of requiring those teachers to carry out the religious instruction for which they were engaged. That would fulfil the views of the hon. Gentleman, and it would fulfil his view. They could not continue these schools *ad interim* as they were in every respect, unless the Government brought in a clause saying that they should go on exactly as if this Act had not passed. The latitude proposed to be given to the teachers was really a serious violation of the 1902 system, and no mere modification of the clause would put them precisely in the position of 1902.

MR. BIRRELL said the Government were not prepared to restore the 1902 conditions for the simple purpose of these temporary schools. That would not do now, because the managers now were the local authority, who had no denominational bias. It would not be a fair thing, therefore, having regard to the temporary user of these schools, that the undenominational local authority should appoint the assistant teachers. He thought the words he had introduced were the best that could be introduced in the circumstances, in order to carry out the view which the Government had always entertained of this clause.

Question, "That Clause 10, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put. and agreed to.

Clause 11:—

MR. ASHLEY moved to insert after "school" in line 15, the words "held or maintained under charitable trusts." The object of the Amendment was to save certain schools from the clutches of Clause 11, which said that an existing voluntary school should not be closed at any time between the passing of the Act and the 1st January, 1908, except with the sanction of the Board of Education. If his Amendment were carried it would exclude privately-owned schools from the scope of this clause. It seemed to be a very high-handed procedure to tell the owner he must either carry on the school until 1908, or the local authority would take the school from him and carry it on. This was all the thanks that a generous-minded man was to get who for many years past at great personal expense had helped forward the cause of both secular and religious education. He quite agreed that schools held under charitable trusts were in a different category, but in the case of a privately-owned school the State had no right to step in in the manner proposed by the clause. On the First Reading of the Bill the Minister for Education said that privately-owned schools were to be exempt from the purview of the Commission. The right hon. Gentleman said that the owners could close them altogether, pull them down, or do what they liked with them. Surely if they recognised that the private owner had these rights as regarded the Commission of three, they must also recognise that he had equal rights in respect of this clause. Under these circumstances they ought to exclude privately-owned schools from the clause.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 7, line 15, after the word 'school,' to insert the words 'held or maintained under charitable trusts.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR W. ROBSON said the Committee would understand that they were here dealing not with schools held under charitable trusts, but principally, at all events, with schools which were in the hands of private owners. The object of the clause under review was to ensure that the local education authority should have some remedy, if the private owner chose between the date of the passing of the Act and January 1st, 1908, to close the school and leave the local education authority—it might be in a single school district—without any means of performing its duties to the children. Without this provision, the very moment that this Bill passed the private owner might close his school and there might be no other accommodation available in the particular parish or district, and the children would have to go without education altogether. Obviously the owner of the school must accept some responsibility, because he had allowed his private property to stand as the only school, it might be, and had availed himself of Parliamentary grants for the purpose of carrying on the school. It would be grossly inequitable, therefore, for him to be permitted, without a word of protest, to close the school without giving any kind of hint to the local education authority. The hon. Gentleman had said a man might do what he liked with his own, but in this case he was straining too much the rights of private ownership. It might be said that there had been a partnership, the owner having provided the building, and the State the maintenance. Any abrupt termination would not be the act of a generous-minded man, but would be a very unjust act, which he hoped the Committee would not allow.

Lord R. CECIL said he was quite unconvinced by the speech of the Solicitor-General. The hon. and learned Gentleman had suggested that if an owner accepted public assistance for which public service had been rendered, he was to be prevented from closing his school because the Government chose to bring in a measure which they called an Education Bill. The Amendment was a right and just one, but he desired to ask his hon. friend whether it was really worth while moving Amendments and making speeches. Sometimes they had been fortunate enough to convert even the Government, but hon. Members behind the Treasury Bench thereupon rose in their places and denounced the Government for their weakness in meeting the Opposition. Even when they did not convince the Government they had very little opportunity of convincing the majority, because they remained outside the Chamber until a division was called, and then they voted against the Amendment merely on the ground that it was an Opposition Amendment. He did not think a debate under these conditions was very useful, besides which they were restricted not only by a very severe closure Resolution, but by irregular methods now used to stifle debate in this House. Under these circumstances he could not see there would be any advantage in his hon. friend further urging this Amendment, and he hoped he would withdraw it.

Sir E. CARSON said he always thought it was a great pity that they should be unnecessarily irritated by the action of anybody in this House. These were matters on which they felt very strongly, and nobody ought to do anything to increase the irritation which necessarily arose. He hoped his hon. friend would persist in this Amendment, because he preferred to argue the question of the clause rather than that of the unfair treatment which they had been accustomed to from the other side in these debates. He would like to draw attention to the discrimination made between schools dedicated to a charitable trust and schools owned by an individual. In the case of a charitable trust the school would be carried on as heretofore, but if an individual owned a school which he had carried on as a denominational school the local education authority could apparently take it off his hands and refuse to carry it on as a denominational school. There was no reason why a distinction should be made between the case of an absolute owner and the case of a school held on trust. Was it fair to say to the absolute owner, "We are going to take your school, but we are not going to have the least regard to your wishes, and we shall carry on the school without the denominational instruction which has hitherto prevailed in it"? He was going to appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite, but he would not do so; not because he did not believe that in their heart of hearts they would wish to do what was fair, but because he knew they were not allowed to do it. Whether they succeeded in having the proposals of the Bill made clear or not, it was their duty, at all events, to show to the House and the country that they had protested against interference with private property in the way contemplated by this clause.

*MR. CAVE said it was clear that Clause 11 was not confined to private owners. It also applied to schools held under charitable trusts. If a school of that kind was about to be closed, the local authority might take possession of it under Clause 11, and while holding possession under that clause would give Cowper-Temple teaching only or no religious teaching at all. That would go on down to January 1st, 1909. When that date arrived there might still be no agreement or scheme for taking over the school; and if so, Clause 10 would come into operation for the year 1909, and the very religious teaching which had been suppressed would have to be restored. That was an extraordinary tangle. He thought the clause ought to be carefully reconsidered.

MR. PAUL said it did astonish him to hear the Member for Dublin University, a great lawyer and greater Member of Parliament, say there was no difference between a school under private ownership and a school under a trust.

SIR E. CARSON: I said there was a great difference.

MR. PAUL said the hon. and learned Gentleman stated that a school under private ownership was subjected to more delicate treatment than a school under a trust. He thought the object of hon. Gentlemen opposite was to maintain the sacredness of trusts. The hon. and learned Gentleman said there was no distinction between denominational and undenominational teaching. That was the question which divided the two sides of the House.

SIR E. CARSON: I never said anything of the kind.

MR. PAUL said that on the Ministerial side they held that undenominational, unsectarian, or as he called it Christian teaching, ought to be entitled to more consideration than denominational, or as he called it, the un-Christian teaching. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why un-Christian?] He was surprised to hear the hon. and learned Gentleman express such a low opinion of trusts and such a high opinion of the schools which were under private ownership.

SIR E. CARSON said the observations of the hon. Member were an absolute travesty of what he had said.

MR. ASHLEY said that no argument had been advanced by either of the two responsible Ministers in reference to his Amendment.

MR. BIRRELL said he had been absent for sixteen minutes to eat what it would be a travesty to call a dinner.

SIR E. CARSON: Why did you abolish the dinner hour?

MR. BIRRELL said his hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General had remainded in attendance during his absence. He felt it to be rather dangerous to take part in a discussion he had not heard. Private schools had received large grants of public money, and it would not have been a hardship, but a righteous act, if the legislature had made it a condition that, if they chose to take this public money, they should continue, and promise to continue, their schools as part of the school system. Anything more reasonable than that he could not conceive. Hon. Gentlemen had been so fed on public money that they had begun to think because they supplied the building—very generously, no doubt—they were entitled to claim the exclusive right of a private owner and to say that at any moment they would turn the building into a greenhouse or a stable, It would be most unreasonable after all these years, if they could not get the full dole, that they should complain because the education authority wished to utilise the school for purposes of national education according to law.

MR. CARLILE (St. Albans): I wish to point out that these men have not received public money.

SIR E. CARSON said he did not think the right hon. Gentleman would have treated this question in the way he had done. All he had said was that the iniquitous private owners had received public grants.

MR. BIRRELL: I did not say "iniquitous."

SIR E. CARSON: The Government is penalising them because they received public grants.

MR. BIRRELL: The receipt of public money involves a public sense of duty.

SIR E. CARSON said the Government was penalising these men because, having built schools, public money had been paid in respect of the public education given. Why should the absolute owners of the school be treated worse than the trustees? That was the whole question, and he hoped that the Solicitor-General would give a definite answer to the Committee. Why should the absolute owners of the school be treated worse than the trustees?

SIR W. ROBSON said that if any owner, either a trustee owner or a private owner, who took advantage of his position after the passing of this Act, and before it came into operation, or anything could be done under it, closed his school to the detriment of the locality, then, he thought, the consequences under Section 11 were by no means too severe.

MR. PAUL said that he wished to apologise to the right hon. and learned Member for Dublin University if in what he had said he had been guilty of a "travesty" of the right hon. Gentleman's statement. It merely resulted from the humble attempt of a layman to understand the language of a great lawyer.

SIR E. CARSON: I entirely concur with the remark of the hon. Gentleman.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said they still awaited an answer to the question why this distinction should be drawn between private owners and trustees in regard to the carrying on of the schools.

AN HON. MEMBER said that an owner was practically a trustee, and if he shut up his school in the way which had been suggested, he would be violating his trust.

*Mr. CAVE proposed for an answer to this question whether a school taken over under Section 11 and carried on as an ordinary provided school until January 1st, 1909, would not, as from that date, fall within Clause 10, and would it not thereupon become the duty of the local authority to revive the denominational teaching? He suggested that the difficulty might be met by introducing into Clause 11 the provisions of sub-section (2) of Clause 10, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider this point before the report stage.

Sir W. ROBSON said that the point would be very carefully considered, but he could not give an immediate answer.

Mr. CARLILE apologised for having intervened in the middle of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, but at the same time he should like the Committee to understand that the private owners did not receive, nor had they ever received, any public money. The private owners supplied the school free of charge, made any alterations required, and got no aid from the rates or taxes. The object of the owners of the private schools in being ready and willing to spend money on their schools was to secure continuity of religious instruction to the children.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 107; Noes, 309. (Division List No. 210.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col W
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Col. Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford. East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Ashley and Mr. Remnant.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, JosephA.(Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H.(Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm.(Banff)
Black, Arthur W.(Bedfordshire
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, T.D.(Derbyshire,N.E.)
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, Rt.Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A.(Inverness Burghs
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph

Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWmJ.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley,William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W.Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson,W.H. (St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody

Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Groove, Archibald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Right. Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold(Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Lief (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, EdmundG.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Leese,SirJosephF. (Accrington)
Lever,A.Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Heny
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)

Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Holland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thos. (W. Monm'th)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hon. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edw. (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (C'rm'rth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of Clauses 11, 12, and 13.

Question put, "That Clause 11 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 395; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 211.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barron, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,J. H. (Essex,Romford)
Bethell, T.R.(Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, ArthurW.(Bedfordshire)
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton,T.D. (Derbyshire,N.E.)
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. D.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce,Rt. Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce, J.A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David (MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin,Charles Ramsay(Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank Radnor
Ellibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fergusson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazelton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras,E.

Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterf'rd)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Enward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H.J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rthn
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Hudd'rsfi'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-

Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Iver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W.
Magnus, Sir Philips
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederic P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir A. Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Clause 12 agreed to.

Question put, "That Clause 13 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 397; Noes, 111. (Division List No. 212.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N. E.)
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer

Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir W. J. (S. Pancras, W.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Charles Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael John
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir G. (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N,
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.

Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mptn)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson,SirG. Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw,Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H. (Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord(Norfolk,Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,Sir J.T(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H.T (Londonderry, N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hn.Victor C. W.
Cecil Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Coates,E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F. (BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt. Hon SirJohn H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
King,SirHenry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar(Dulwich)
Lee,ArthurH Hants.(Fareham
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'IverSirLewis (EdinburghW

Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, Jn. (Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rasch, Sir Frederic Carne
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W.F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out Part II. (Clauses 14 to 24 inclusive)."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That Part II. stand part of the Bill," put forthwith, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, and negatived.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

The House resumed.

SHROPSHIRE, WORCESTERSHIRE AND STAFFORDSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) asked the representative of the Board of Trade for some information in regard to the Bill. He had been instructed by Dudley Corporation and another public body to oppose the Bill, but he understood that they were now perfectly well satisfied with the pledges secured from the promoters of the measure. The statements which had been placed in his hands by the Dudley Corporation, and other opponents of the Bill, raised a question on which this House ought to be satisfied, namely, the *bona fides* of the promoters. It appeared that the Bill was originally introduced in 1903, and nearly all the powers now asked were secured then, except that under the present Bill there was to be an extension of the territory over which operations were to be conducted. Under the 1903 Bill there was a time limit of two years, and during that period absolutely nothing had been done in the way of putting into practice the powers given by Parliament. What was still more important was the statement of the Dudley Corporation that on the previous occasion the Bill was not really introduced by a *bona fide* company in any sense of the term, that the promoters were the Parliamentary agents and solicitors who backed the measure, and that, to a great extent, the company was bogus. It was further stated that the moment a monopoly was secured by that Act the gentlemen concerned sold the powers they had obtained under the Act to a syndicate. That syndicate had been unable during the intervening time to carry out the provisions of the Act, and now application was made to Parliament again for the purpose of reviving the powers which were obtained in 1903, and which had been allowed to lapse. The House had no guarantee even now that the promoters intended to use the powers. The House ought to get some security that this was a *bona fide* promotion, and not merely a speculation. They should be fully assured that the promoters, if they secured the passage of the Bill, were not immediately going to sell the powers as in the case of the previous Act. He was not inclined to proceed with his Motion that the Bill be read a second time upon this day three months, as the Committee upstairs would have an opportunity of going into these matters. At the same time, in view of the facts which he had mentioned, the question was no longer merely local. It was a question whether powers could be obtained from Parliament by two or three persons, and then sold to others who had nothing to do with the original undertaking. He hoped if the Bill went upstairs the Committee would thoroughly investigate the whole of the circumstances.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport) said the opposition of the local authorities to this Bill had been withdrawn, and he had satisfied himself as far as he could that the financial support behind the Bill was ample. He had seen the names of the financial group, if he might use that term, and although he did not know them all, he recognised the names of several gentlemen who were regarded as sound financiers. He would point out that the House of Lords had investigated the financial position of the company, and had put in a clause requiring £300,000 of capital to be set up within eighteen months.

MR. J. WARD: An exactly similar provision was in the original Act, but it was never complied with.

MR. KEARLEY said he was not able to speak of what had been done in the past. He could only speak of what had been done during this session. It was quite impossible for the House to constitute itself into a Committee to inquire into all these details. The House might accept the assurance that he had had an opportunity of seeing the financial group who were behind this Bill, and he believed that their financial obligations would be carried out. He therefore urged the House to give the Bill a Second Reading, and leave the Committee upstairs to make what further inquiries might be deemed necessary.

MR. MIDDLEMORE said that on behalf of a large number of the inhabitants of Harbourne, which was a residential community, he opposed the Bill. Many of these people let their houses at £20 a year and upwards, and their whole living would be affected by the generating station being planted at the spot indicated in the Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at twenty minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 11*th July*, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [Lords]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [Lords]; Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [Lords]; Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords] (by order). Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table. Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; From Bampton; Derby; Elmstead; Hope Bagot; Kensal Green; and Wigan. To lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petitions against alteration of Law; From Leadenham; Luddesdown (two); Potters Bar; and Snodland. To lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Paisley, against; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1901) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.

Petition from Dorking, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

JURORS' EXPENSES BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION, ETC., (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; From Glasgow (two); Kirkintilloch; and Perth. To lie upon the Table.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANDISE MARKS BILL.

Petition from Walsall, against; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petitions for alteration; From Brighton; Govan; Honiton; Huntly; Stretford; West Aberdeenshire; and Westminster. To lie upon the Table.

POTTER, ROBERT HENRY.

Petition from Robert Henry Potter, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION BILL [LORDS].

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY TICKETS BILL.

Petition from Walsall in favour; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE DISPUTES BILL.

Petition from Walsall, against; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE UNIONS AND TRADE DISPUTES BILL.

Petition from Walsall, against; to lie upon the Table.

TRUST ACCOUNTS (AUDIT) BILL.

Petition from Walsall, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

VAGRANT CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from Keynsham, against; to lie upon the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

IRISH FISHING-BOAT BUILDING.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 27th March; *Sir Thomas Esmonde*]; to lie upon the Table.

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901.

Account presented, showing the Money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of The Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and of the Money received, expended, and borrowed, and Securities created under the said Act, to 31st March, 1906, together with a Copy of the Report of the Chairman of the Pacific Cable Board [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 248.]

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Copy presented, of Draft Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department under the Prisons Acts, 1877 and 1898, with respect to the constitution of the Visiting Committees of Bristol and Shepton Mallet Prisons [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Accrington, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain Shops within the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series. No. 3666 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRANSVAAL.

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence relating to Labour in the Transvaal Mines [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

INCLOSURES (COUNTY OF SUFFOLK).

Return ordered, "showing (1) the number of Inclosures of common land made under the Inclosure Acts of 1845 to 1899 in the County of Suffolk; (2) list of parishes within which such lands are wholly or partly situate; (3) total acreage of such Inclosures; (4) average acreage of such Inclosures."—(*Mr. George Hardy.*)

LAND JUDGES COURT (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "by counties, of the Estates in the Land Judges Court over which Receivers have been appointed (in continuation of Parliamentary Papers, No. 182, of Session 1904, and No. 256, of Session 1905)."—(*Mr. Clancy.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Raffling at Lockerbie Town Hall Bazaar.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether he is aware of the raffling of a £500 Deasey motor car in connection with the Lockerbie Town Hall bazaar; whether the Government has taken legal action in connection with any similar case; and, if so, would the Government be prepared to take action on the present occasion.

(*Answered by Sir John Walton.*) The facts alleged in the Question are not within the knowledge or the sphere of action of the Attorney-General. He has, however, communicated with the Lord-Advocate, who is instituting inquiry on the subject.

Annual Report of Emigration and Immigration.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): To ask the President of the Board of Trade when he proposes to issue the Annual Report on emigration and immigration in 1905; and what is the reason for it being issued this year so much later than last year.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) The Report will be issued in the course of this week. The delay is partly attributable to pressure of business, partly to the printer.

Telephone Facilities at Finchley and Hendon.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): To ask the Postmaster-General if he can state what are the precise difficulties which stand in the way of the establishment by the Post Office of a telephone exchange to serve the districts of Finchley and Hendon; and whether in view of the inconvenience caused by the absence of such an exchange, he can hold out any hope that these difficulties will be overcome at an early date.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) A scheme was drawn up some time ago for providing an exchange service in the districts of Finchley and Hendon, but the final settlement of the plans has been considerably delayed by the unwillingness of the local authorities to grant necessary wayleaves. A site has been purchased and plans prepared for the exchange building, the erection of which will be begun at an early date. If the local authorities will render reasonable assistance, as now appears probable, the exchange system will, I hope, be ready for use during the first half of next year.

Sales on the Warrenscourt Estate, County Cork.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the tenants on the Warrenscourt estate, in the division of Mid-Cork, signed their purchase agreements on the 1st June, 1904; have they yet received their vesting orders, and, if not, what steps do the Estates Commissioners propose to take to expedite the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the agreements for purchase in this case, though dated 1st June, 1904, were not lodged till February, 1905. The agreements are now being checked preparatory to an inspection of the lands, which will, it is expected, take place at an early date.

Macroom District Council and extra land for labourers' cottages.

MR. SHEEHAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Macroom rural district council recently promoted a scheme for providing additional half-acre plots to many of the cottages already built in the union; in what position does this scheme at present stand; has the award of the arbitrator yet been made; and, seeing the urgency which exists for giving these plots to the labourers so that they may have them prepared for planting in the coming spring, will he direct the Local Government Board to expedite the matter in every way possible.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The arbitrator's award in respect to the lands included in the scheme in question, which embraces 256 additional half-acres, was made on 4th June, and on 18th June notification was received from the Commissioners of Public Works that the requisite loan in the matter had been sanctioned by the Treasury. There is no reason why the plots should not be available for planting in the coming spring. The matter now rests entirely with the rural district council, but if the Local Government Board should be in a position to expedite the matter they will do so.

Crofters Act Amendment Bill—Date of Introduction.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state whether the promised Crofters Acts Amendment Bill will be introduced before the rising of Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) If at all possible, the Bill will be introduced before the recess.

Lisburn Workhouse Officials.

MR. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the officials of the Lisburn workhouse, who are implicated in the recent incident, are suspended pending the result of the Local Government Board inquiry; and, if not, for what reason.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Local Government Board's inspector in charge of Lisburn union recently paid a surprise visit to the workhouse, and, as a result of his inspection, reported to the Local Government Board that both the master and the porter had been seriously neglecting their duties. The inspector's Report was conveyed to the board of guardians, and it was open to them to suspend the officials concerned, but, so far as the Local Government Board are aware, they have not done so. They have, however, asked for a sworn inquiry into the facts, and the Board have acceded to their request. The inquiry will shortly be held. The manner in which the clerk of the union had discharged his duty was also unfavourably commented upon, but the guardians have no power to suspend this officer.

Italian Government and British Pilchards.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British demands to Italy in regard to pilchards will be satisfied at an early date; and, if so, when the alteration in the existing tariff will be made, and what would be the conditions.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) The Italian Government have, in reply to representations from His Majesty's Government, informed us that, in view of their approaching commercial negotiations with other countries interested in the same sort of fish, they cannot for the moment comply with our wishes, though they have every disposition to do so. They add, however, that it will be possible to satisfy our request at no distant date. There are no conditions attached.

Grant for Pier at Ardarroch, Kishorn.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the fact that a pier is urgently needed at Ardarroch, Kishorn, Ross-shire, will he state whether the Fishery Board can see their way to make the requisite grant.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Fishery Board have received no application for a grant towards the cost of a pier at Ardarroch. If such application be made, it will be considered on its merits, and in relation to the Board's resources, along with other applications before them.

Arrears of Rates.

MR. WEIR: To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that some rate collectors claim arrears of rates for periods extending back upwards of ten years after the rates for the current year have been paid; and, seeing that it not infrequently happens that receipts, except for quite recent years, have been destroyed, can he see his way to recommend local authorities to adopt some more satisfactory system of collection.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Local Government Board for Scotland state that they are not aware that any rate collectors follow the practice referred to by the hon. Member. Arrears of assessment are usually either recovered or written off as irrecoverable before the lapse of ten years. Without information as to cases of hardship, I am not prepared to make any recommendation to local authorities on the subject.

Patent Agents.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what is the number of registered patent agents; how many of the registered patent agents are members of the Chartered Institute of Patent Agents; how many registered patent agents have had their names erased from the register of patent agents for disgraceful professional conduct since the register was begun under The Patents Act, 1888; and whether the comptroller of the Patent Office has had any dealings in reference to patent business with any of those whose names have been erased from the register for that cause since their names were so erased and since rule 81 of the Patents Rules, 1903, came into force.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) The number of registered patent agents was, on 6th July, 1906, 257. Of these, 157 are members of the Chartered Institute of Patent Agents. The first entry made in the register is dated 2nd July, 1889, and since that date eight names have been erased from the register for disgraceful professional conduct. In patent cases pending, when an agent's name has been so erased, all persons for whom such agents is acting are informed of what has been done. In certain exceptional cases where the agent has already been paid for the completion of the work in hand and his client has asked that he may be allowed to complete it, the comptroller has continued to recognise the man as agent until the work has been completed. In no other cases has the comptroller knowingly recognised as agent in patent business anyone whose name has been struck off the register for disgraceful professional conduct.

Balnamore Postal Delivery Delays.

MR. GLENDINNING (Antrim, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General why the messenger from Ballymoney post office to Balnamore, etc., is detained at the head office twenty-five minutes longer than any other messenger, thereby causing inconvenience to people living on his round; and whether, in view of the necessity for a second delivery on the same round, will he arrange that the messenger, as in other cases shall be allowed the use of a bicycle, and thereby at a trifling cost meet the requirements of this district.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Inquiry is being made on the subject, and I will send the hon. Member a reply in due course.

Taw and Torridge Gravel Beds.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what is the total amount of money received by the Woods and Forests Department in respect of dues on gravel taken from gravel beds situated in the estuary of the Taw and Torridge, in North Devon.

(*Answered by Mr McKenna.*) Such part of the foreshore in the estuary of the Taw and Torridge as is under the management of the Commissioners of Woods, together with certain foreshore of the sea south of the estuary, also under the management of those Commissioners, has been leased to the Northam Urban District Council from Michaelmas, 1904. The total amount of royalties received from the council in respect of sand, etc., removed since the commencement of the lease has been £665, 19s. 3d.

MR. SOARES: To ask the President of the Board of Trade what is the total amount of money received by his Department in respect of dues on gravel taken from gravel beds situated in the estuary of the Taw and Torridge, in North Devon.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) Under the terms of a lease, dated July 8th, 1905, granted by the Board of Trade to the Braunton Parish Council, royalty at the rate of 4d. per ton has to be paid to the Board on March 1st in each year, in respect of materials removed during the previous year. The total sum paid by the parish council up to the present, under the provisions of the lease in Question, in respect of the removal of gravel from the gravel beds referred to by the hon. Member, is £42 11s. 4d. No payment has been made by any other body or person.

Board of Trade and Trinity House.

MR. SOARES: To ask the President of the Board of Trade what is the nature of the control, if any, exercised by the Board of Trade over Trinity House.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) The powers of the Board of Trade over the Trinity House are set out in Part XI. of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894. It is hardly possible to define those powers in reply to a Question, but it may be stated generally that the control is mainly a financial one. The Trinity House have no power to spend money on lights or buoys without the sanction of the Board of Trade. The Board of Trade have no power to expend money for these purposes on their own initiative.

Shipowners' Committee on Coast Lighting.

MR. SOARES: To ask the President of the Board of Trade who are the gentlemen comprising the shipowners' committee with regard to the lighting of the coasts of England · how is such committee constituted: what are its statutory powers; and what Minister takes responsibility for its actions.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) The Advisory Committee upon New Lighthouse Works consist of the following Gentlemen:—

Mr. W. F. G. Anderson, Glasgow (Chairman).
Sir Alfred Jones, K.C.M.G., Liverpool.
Sir John Gunn, Cardiff.
Sir Henry Hozier, K.C.B., Secretary of Lloyds.
Sir John Glover, London.
The Right Hon. W. J. Pirrie.
Mr. J. B. Adam, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Mr. John Davies. Liverpool.
Mr. E. Handcock, Cardiff.
Mr. F. L. Heyn, J.P., Belfast.
Mr. F. C. Gardiner, Glasgow.
Mr. T. F. Blackwell, London.

The Committee was formed by the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom at the suggestion of the late Lord Ritchie, when President of the Board of Trade, for the purpose of representing to the Board of Trade and the general lighthouse authorities the views of shipowners and others with regard to all Questions of new works proposed to be carried out by the lighthouse authorities. It has no statutory powers and no Ministerial responsibility is involved.

Estuary of the Taw and Torridge.

Mr. SOARES: To ask the President of the Board of Trade upon what fund falls the expense of buoying the estuary of the Taw and Torridge; upon whom falls the responsibility for the efficiency of such buoying; and whether the President of the Board of Trade is responsible in the House of Commons in the event of the buoys being insufficient, inefficient, and dangerous to life.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) There being no local lighthouse authority for this estuary the superintendence and management of lighthouses, buoys, and beacons is vested by statute in the Trinity House, and the expense falls upon the general lighthouse fund. The responsibility for the efficiency of the buoying rests with the Trinity House. I may remind my hon. friend that it is proposed to refer the whole Question of the administration of the general lighthouse authorities to a Royal Commission.

Board of Education Staff.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the President of the Board of Education if provision is to be made for increasing the staff of the Board of Education in respect of the new Education Act, during 1906–7.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am not yet prepared to make any statement upon the point.

Estate Duty Committee Witnesses.

Mr. SEARS (Cheltenham): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any witnesses examined before the 1898 Estate Duty Committee, presided over by the present Secretary of State for War, were drawn from outside of Somerset House; will he state what witnesses were examined; and whether a Report referred to in the House should not be laid upon the Table.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The list of witnesses did not include any persons from outside Somerset House. The witnesses examined were the Solicitor of Inland Revenue, the Controller and Deputy Controller of the Legacy and Succession Duty Department, and several of the principal clerks in that Department. The fact that I have answered a Question put to me by the hon. Gentleman about a confidential Report certainly does not impose upon me any obligation to lay the Report upon the Table.

Short Service Army Pensions.

Mr. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): To ask the Secretary of State for War on what date the Army regulation granting pensions of 4d. and 6d. a day to short service men on reaching the age of 50, and which was in force in 1865 was cancelled.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) These deferred pension regulations were cancelled by Royal Warrant of July 23rd, 1864, but soldiers who enlisted before September 10th, 1864 (the date of the promulgation of the Warrant) were entitled to claim the benefit of the deferred pension regulations.

Papers on South Africa.

Mr. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): To ask the Prime Minister when His Majesty's Government will lay further Papers relating to South African affairs upon the Table.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*). Further Papers on the labour question are being laid upon the Table to-day, and will be published in a few days' time. Papers of a more general character and on the Natal disturbances will also be laid.

Transvaal and Orange Colony Constitution.

Mr. LYTTELTON: To ask the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to effect the proposed constitutional changes in the Transvaal and Orange Colony, or either of them, by Letters Patent, Local Ordinance, or Act of the Imperial Parliament; and, if the intention be not to proceed by Act of the Imperial Parliament, what opportunity will be given for discussion of the policy of the Government in this matter before the change is finally made.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) It is proposed to effect the change by Letters Patent, and the House will have the usual opportunities of discussing the action so taken.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

The Naval Manœuvres.

MR. BEAUCHAMP (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state the number of merchant vessels, other than those chartered, which placed themselves at the disposal of the Admiralty during the recent manœuvres; whether all or any of them sailed under convoy; whether any were captured; and, if so, how many.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): It is not possible to answer this Question at present as all the detailed Reports have not yet reached the Admiralty.

Birmingham Small Arms Company.

MR. BRANCH (Middlesex, Enfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will be prepared to inform the House, on the Ordnance Vote, of the dividend and bonus paid to their shareholders by the Birmingham Small Arms Company during the last fifteen years. I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a secret reserve fund has been formed by the Birmingham Small Arms Company, the expenditure from which would not be disclosed to the shareholders; and whether seeing that the factory receives Government orders, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): The War Department has no information on the points raised in this and the following Question, which is not open to the general public. I cannot, therefore, undertake to supply the hon. Member with the information he asks for.

Sparkbrook Factory.

MR. BRANCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War at what date the negotiations for the transfer of Sparkbrook to a private firm were commenced, when were they completed, and when was the promise made to give them 25 per cent. of the orders placed to the private trade; and whether there is any promise or intention to give this company orders beyond the next three financial years.

MR. BUCHANAN: The negotiations were commenced on November 1st, 1905, and the agreement with the purchasers was signed on June 8th, 1906. The promise to give them 25 per cent. of the trade orders for three years forms part of the second Schedule to the agreement. There is no promise to give the purchasers any special proportion of the orders beyond the next three years, and it is impossible to make any prophecy as to the probable allocation of orders when that period is completed.

Piershill Cavalry Barracks.

LORD TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Piershill Cavalry Barracks at Edinburgh have been recently condemned as insanitary; and whether cases of diphtheria have lately occurred there.

MR. BUCHANAN: These barracks have not been condemned, and the cause of the one case of diphtheria cannot, in the opinion of the medical authorities, be traced to any actual insanitary condition in the officers' mess where it occurred. The barracks, however, are old, and a sanitary inspection which I recently ordered discloses that there are undoubtedly defects in the drainage system. I hope to be able to do something shortly to provide for the condition of affairs.

Preston Barracks, Brighton.

LORD TURNOUR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to carry out the repairs at Preston Barracks, Brighton.

MR. BUCHANAN: The normal repairs and periodical painting will proceed in the ordinary course. The remodelling of the drainage will shortly be taken in hand.

Imperial Yeomanry Officers' Pay.

LORD TURNOUR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the reason for witholding the pay of the Imperial Yeomanry officers attending the cavalry school for six weeks after the course has been completed.

MR. BUCHANAN: Payment is not made until the result of the course, in regard to obtaining the necessary certificates, is known. If the hon. Member will give me any instance of undue delay I will have the matter inquired into.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): May I inform the hon. Gentleman that my hon. friend himself has been kept waiting for six weeks, after he has passed his examination.

MR. BUCHANAN: If the noble Lord will communicate to the Secretary of State the details of his own hard case the Secretary of State will inquire into it.

LORD TURNOUR: I will do so very soon.

Trinity College, Dublin, Army Candidates.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the War Office will consent to continue the arrangements made for Army candidates from the University of Trinity College, Dublin, which have been in force for eighteen months, and carry out his statement on this subject to the effect that on receipt of the direct application from the university authorities all further arrangements will be made by the War Office; and whether, in carrying out those arrangements, the forms and medical certificates now asked for, for the first time, will be dispensed with, having hitherto by experience been proved to be unnecessary.

MR. BUCHANAN: The present arrangements are quite simple, and were specially designed to give the universities and their candidates as little trouble as possible. The forms and certificates are necessary. It is not proposed to make any further change as suggested in the Question.

Army Statistics.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrew's Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the calculated reserve of a two-battalion regiment of the Line at the present establishment, the men comprising the regiment being enlisted on a nine years term of colour service; and what is the average annual cost per man of the rank and file of such a regiment, taking men with the colours and in the reserve together, for the purpose of striking the average.

MR. BUCHANAN: The calculated reserve for a two-battalion regiment of the line with nine years enlistments is 517. The average establishment of rank and file per battalion in the pay of the Imperial Government (excluding India) is 755. In a regiment of two battalions with a depôt, the total establishment of rank and file with colours would be 1,560. The average cost per head of these men and the reservists would be £46 6s.

Sentences on Chinese Coolies.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the number of separate sentences passed on the Chinese labourers on the Rand up to the last month, and the total number of Chinese labourers who have been, since the beginning of the experiment, employed there.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The total number of separate sentences up to April 30th is 12,960; the total number of Chinese employed since the beginning of the experiment is about 60,000. Such figures are disquieting, and sustain the views entertained by His Majesty's Government towards the experiment of Chinese indentured labour. It should, however, also be noticed that the Attorney-General pointed out in September last that only a small proportion of the sentences were convictions for offences which could in any way be called serious. (See p. 64 of Cd. 2786) *e.g.*, I observe that for the months August to November, 1905, out of 3,735 convictions, 110 represented sentences of six months, and only nineteen sentences of over six months.

Singapore Docks.

SIR C. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Crown Colony called the Straits Settlements has been induced to acquire certain docks at Singapore from a company called the Tanjong Pagar Dock Company, at a cost of about £5,500,000; whether the move for the acquisition of these docks originated with the Committee of Imperial Defence; will he say by whom were the arbitrators nominated to settle the cost, and by whom was the referee or umpire in the arbitration appointed; whether he will briefly state the grounds on which the acquisition of these docks was recommended or approved by the late Government, and whether the present Government approve of the acquisition and of the reasons assigned therefore by their predecessors; and whether he will state the names and addresses of the directors and principal shareholders of the Tanjong Pagar Dock Company, and say if the award works out at $755 per $100 share.

MR. CHURCHILL: The undertaking of the Tanjong Pagar Dock Company was compulsorily acquired by the Government of the Straits Settlements under the provisions of a Colonial Ordinance passed in 1905. The total amount of the award given by the umpire is about £3,319,000. The proposal for the acquisition of the docks did not originate with the Committee of Imperial Defence. The Colonial Government and the company each nominated an arbitrator, and those two arbitrators appointed their umpire. I will place in the Library of the House a copy of the Ordinance to which I have referred, and of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council for 1905. If the hon. Member will refer to page 9 of the Appendix to the volume, he will find a despatch, dated November 4th, 1904, from the late Secretary of State, which sets out fully the reasons for suggesting the acquisition of this undertaking. The Secretary of State does not feel called upon to review a transaction which was wholly concluded before the sanction of the present Ministry to office, and which has been the subject of a legally constituted tribunal of arbitration. The Directors are Messrs. W. P. Waddell, J. E. Romenij, C. Sugden, W. H. Shelford, and A. G. Faber; they are all resident in Singapore. I have no official information as to the names and addresses of the principal shareholders, but I observe that a list has appeared on more than one occasion in a London financial newspaper. The calculation in the last part of the Question is approximately correct.

Rosettenville Citizens and the Coolie Outrages.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): On behalf of the hon. Member for Chester, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been directed to the meeting of citizens held at Rosettenville, a suburb of Johannesburg, demanding more adequate police protection against outrages committed by Chinese coolies; and what steps, if any, have been taken to meet this demand.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have not received an official report as to this meeting or as to any specific action arising out of the recommendation passed at the meeting.

Nourse Deep Mines—Coolie Riot.

MR. MACKARNESS: On behalf of the hon. Member for Chester, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has yet received the promised information regarding the riot of the Chinese coolies on the Nourse Deep mine on the Witwatersrand.

MR. CHURCHILL: Lord Selborne has furnished the following account. Shift of 450 men was called upon to go down to the shaft to work until midnight on Saturday, June 16th. They agreed, and fell in at usual time. When some two thirds of the way to the shaft someone raised the cry, "Why should we work on Saturday afternoon? Let us go back and refuse." This was apparently agreed to, and the Chinese police and boss boys who protested were roughly handled. The coolies supplied themselves with stones on the way back to the compound, stoned the controllers and the hospital. Some person so far unknown, appears to have fired a revolver, whereupon the coolies demolished the doors and windows of the controller's house. The white gate guard of the compound closed the gates to the returning coolies, who smashed the windows and doors of the compound office, thereby effecting an entrance. The gate guard was then mauled by the coolies and in self defence fired, injuring several of their number. He was subsequently helped away by Chinese compound coolies. Disturbance then subsided and coolies turned quietly to work. The affair was unpremeditated. None of opposite shift took part. There were nine casualties amongst the coolies, one having his leg broken by revolver bullet. Ringleaders, nine in number, were arrested and brought up for trial July 4th. Case remanded until July 12th.

Alleged Flogging in the Cason Mine.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that a Government inquiry was held in the compound of the Cason mine on June 15th last into the truth or otherwise of the affidavit sworn by Mr. Thomas Ratcliffe regarding the flogging of a Chinese coolie; that the inquiry was attended by the general manager of the mine and other persons connected witn the Farrar group, together with the Government officials and five commissioners of police; that in the course of the inquiry coolie No. 277 stated, through an interpreter, that the compound manager and the Chinese controls intimidated him so that he swore untruthfully that he had not been flogged, but that the other affidavit which he had taken stating that he had been flogged was the true one; will he say whether Mr. Ratcliffe was discharged within a few hours of his having sworn the affidavit which was the subject of the inquiry; and whether he will state what steps the Government propose to take to protect the coolies and the white miners from undue influence exercised by the mine managers.

MR. CHURCHILL: So far the Secretary of State has received telegraphic information to the effect that "charge of assault was preferred against Jimson, compound manager in question, and case heard at Boksburg on June 25th. Case was dismissed by magistrate, who stated it was concocted charge on part of Radcliffe, on whose affidavit proceedings were instituted. Radcliffe was arrested and charged with perjury, preparatory examination being down for hearing July 13th. The Secretary of State has telegraphed for information on the Government inquiry to which my hon. friend's Question refers, and of which we have so far heard nothing.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. CHURCHILL said he hoped to be in possession of the information asked for by Monday next.

Native Rising in Natal—Treatment of Surrendered Prisoners.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the request made by the Natal troops to Colonel Mackenzie that no surrenders should be received from Zulu natives against whom military operations are being conducted; and whether he proposes to take any action to ensure that the granting of quarter to surrendering foes, as provided for in the code which regulates warfare, shall be observed.

MR. LONSDALE: Before the hon. Gentleman answers that Question, may I ask whether his attention has been called to the disgraceful letter of the hon. Member?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. Member ought to know that that Question is inadmissible. He submitted it to me, and I declined to allow it to appear on the Paper. The hon. Member ought not to have asked it.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have seen the report in a press telegram to which the hon. Member refers. I cannot tell how far it is well-founded. But even if a cry of "No Prisoners" were raised by individual troopers in a moment of excitement and under intense provocation that fact is in itself a proof that an opposite policy towards surrendering Zulus was being pursued by the officers in responsible command and that mercy is being accorded to those who wish to surrender.

MR. KEIR HARDIE asked whether the hon. Gentleman could say what number of coloured people had been picked up wounded as compared with those who were killed.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir, I can only refer the hon. Gentleman to the Answer I gave him last week, which was as full as I could make it.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Will the hon. Gentleman cause inquiries to be made? We have daily reports of the number of natives killed, but nothing is said as to the number picked up wounded. I will put the Question down again this day week.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) asked whether the hon. Gentleman had any information as to how many more Kaffirs it was intended to kill before they brought this war to a close.

[No Answer was returned.]

Crimes by Chinese Coolies.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he is aware that there have been 224 serious crimes committed by Chinese coolies during the months of April and May, including seventy-nine cases of house-breaking, and twenty-three cases of murder; whether any steps have been taken by the mine-owners to ensure that the 8,000 Chinese, whom they propose to introduce before the end of the year, do not belong to the criminal classes; and, if not, whether, in the interests of the resident population of the Transvaal, His Majesty's Government can undertake to prevent the further importation of labourers dangerous to the lives and property of the people of this colony.

MR. CHURCHILL: My right hon. friend has requested me to reply to this Question. The numbers which I furnished to the hon. Member yesterday give seventy cases of house-breaking in the two months. I have on a former occasion pointed out that the mine-owners and the labour agency they employ have every inducement not to ship coolies of the criminal classes, as all dangerous characters are liable to be repatriated at at the mine-owners' expense. The Secretary of State is informed that practically all the crimes mentioned other than house-breaking are cases of crime committed by one coolie upon another.

MR. MACKARNESS asked whether the victims were not usually white people?

MR. CHURCHILL: I think the figures I gave yesterday referred mainly to white people.

Vizagapatam Railway and Harbours.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Raipur-Vizianagram Railway will very insufficiently serve the vast tract of country it is intended to bring into the general network of communications in India unless it is accompanied by a simultaneous improvement of the harbour of Vizagapatam, which improvement, it is understood, forms no part of the scheme at present sanctioned and under consideration; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR INDIA (Mr. JOHN ELLIS, Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): The railway from Raipur to Vizianagram has been sanctioned independently of any harbour scheme; but the question of improving the harbour facilities at Vizagapatam will no doubt be borne in mind by the Government of India; and the Secretary of State does not at present see any reason for taking any action in the matter.

Dog Tax.

MR. SEARS (Cheltenham): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will say by whom the parochial officers who assessed the dog tax prior to 1867 were appointed; whether they were responsible to the Government or to the district commissioners of taxes; whether the tax officers said to have been over the parochial assessors were surveyors of taxes merely, appointed by the Government as a check on the work of parochial officers, or what was the relation of the tax officers to the parochial assessors; and whether surveyors of taxes now occupy the same position as formerly.

I beg also to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Board of Inland Revenue, in estimating the saving in poundage in respect of the transfer of the dog tax in 1867, took into account all the facts of the case, including the reduction in the duty from 12s. to 5s.; whether the savings in 1867 of poundage, etc., of £6,500 and of £60,000 in 1869 from further transfers, were actual savings apart from the increased revenue received from the increased number of dogs brought to charge; was there any set off, and, if so, what was the nature and amount of such set off; will he say whether the grant of increased pay and allowances in 1868 was the result of a movement on the part of the officers which had been in progress some years; and whether the Board at the time connected any part of this increase with the transfer.

I beg further to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Board of Inland Revenue made a proposal in 1860 to destroy the parochial system of assessing and collecting taxes root and branch, and issued a scheme to the Commissioners of Taxes contemplating this, or whether the transfers which took place in 1869 represented the complete and final proposals of the Board; will he say by whom the Income-Tax A and B and the Inhabited House Duty in the metropolis was assessed prior to 1873 and subsequently, the amount of annual saving in poundage, if any, effected in that year; by whom the income-tax, under Schedules D and E, was collected prior to 1879 and subsequently; whether any experiment was made in 1881–2 in employing Government instead of parochial officials in any districts in England; and in what districts were experiments made, and what was the result.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): I will deal with these three Questions together. I have nothing to add to the information which I have already given the hon. Gentleman in reply to numerous previous Questions on the same and similar subjects. I cannot allow the time and energies of the officers of a hard-worked public Department to be diverted from their real duties by pursuing researches into matters which happened from twenty-five to forty years ago, and which in my opinion have little or no bearing upon the administrative work of to-day.

Leckhampton Right of Way Riots.

MR. S. COLLINS (Lambeth, Kennington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the sentences passed, at Gloucester last Friday, by Mr. Justice Lawrance on certain persons for alleged rioting, in their defence of the rights of a public footpath at Leckhampton; and whether he will take into his consideration the mitigation of the sentences.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I have as yet seen only a newspaper report of the case in question; but it will be my duty carefully to consider any petition that may be addressed to me by or on behalf of the prisoners.

Tramway Gradients.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the almost daily accounts of tramway cars getting out of control when descending hills; and whether, having regard to the accidents that follow, he will consider the advisability of proclaiming such hills dangerous and forbidding their use until some safe method of controlling the cars is adopted, or what other steps he proposes to take to safeguard the public. I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, having regard to the fact that there is apparently no brake which can be safely relied upon under all conditions to arrest tramway cars on steep gradients, he will consider the advisability of the Board of Trade refusing to grant any new orders for tramway lines to be laid on hills which have more than a very moderate gradient.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (MR. KEARLEY, Devonport): In reply to the two Questions of the Hon. Member pending the receipt and consideration of reports by the inspecting officers of the Board of Trade on the accidents of this kind which have recently been the subject of inquiry, I am unable to state what action it will be found necessary to take. The whole subject is, however, engaging the most careful attention of the Board's technical advisers.

MR. FELL: Will any further orders be issued enabling tramways to go up hills which might be classed as dangerous pending the inquiry?

*MR. KEARLEY said the Board of Trade already possessed prohibitory powers as regards mechanical traction for tramways on hills believed to be dangerous.

Vaccination Exemption Certificates.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of certificates of conscientious objection taken out under the Vaccination Act, 1898.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): According to the latest Returns I have, the total number of certificates of conscientious objection received by the vaccination officers up to December 31st last was 468,600.

Staines Workhouse Children and Ascot Races.

*MR. SPICER (Hackney, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been drawn to the fact that the Poor Law children of the Staines Union have been for some years, and were this year, allowed to stand at the union gates during Ascot week with the avowed object of obtaining alms from visitors to the races; and whether he can do anything to discourage this practice.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have made inquiry on this subject, and am informed that many years ago the children were allowed to stand at the workhouse gates to see the visitors going to and returning from Ascot, and that they have continued to be permitted to do so, not for begging purposes, but as a treat and a break in their lives. Some of the people throw them money, and this is spent on an outing for the children at the Crystal Palace or elsewhere. The matter is one which is entirely within the discretion of the guardians.

MR. SPICER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that one of the guardians offered—in the event of the practice being discontinued—to make up the sum usually contributed so that the children should not be deprived of their treat?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Yes, but on the other hand it was thought that perhaps the sight of these innocent happy children might induce some of the passers-by to see the error of their ways.

Grove Park Workhouse.

MR. BARKER (Penryn and Falmouth): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board with reference to the proved charges against the engineers at the Grove Park workhouse for improperly receiving stores, and to the subsequent increases of their salaries by the Greenwich guardians, what reply has been received from the guardians in response to the letter from the Local Government Board; and what action is proposed to be taken in order to compel this authority to carry out the wishes of the Department in this and other matters.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The guardians promised to reconsider and report on the increases of salaries to the officers referred to. I have asked to be furnished with a copy of the report, but have not at present received it. I have now repeated my request.

Traction Traffic in London Streets.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether trains consisting of a heavy traction engine and two or three loaded waggons are allowed to use the public streets in any of the principal capitals of Europe, besides London; and, if so, whether these trains are allowed in the other capitals to run at any hour of the day or night.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I regret that I am not in possession of particulars as to the regulations in force in foreign capitals on the subject referred to by the hon. Member, so as to enable me to give him the information he requires.

Findhorn Postal Arrangments.

MR. A. WILLIAMSON (Elgin and Nairn): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if representations have been made to him regarding the improvement of the postal service to and from Findhorn; and whether he can now see his way to improve the present arrangements with a view to the convenience of summer visitors and others.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I have received applications for an additional mail from Findhorn, and I am glad to say that I have been able to authorise a despatch at 5 p.m.

Canadian Mail Service.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN (Galway): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Allan Line new steamer "Victorian" accomplished the voyage, with Canadian mails, in five days, five hours, having left Rimoriski at 9.30 a.m. on Friday, June 23rd, and reached Moville on June 28th at 1.30 p.m.; and whether, in view of the fast service provided by this boat and other new steamers of this line and other lines carrying the mails to Canada, he will, with a view to an economical and expeditious service, consider the advisability of in future having all mid-week mails intended for Canada forwarded by these lines, instead of dividing them as now between German and other lines running to New York.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am aware of the efforts which are being made to improve and accelerate the direct packet service between this country and Canada; and the hon. Member may rest assured that full use will be made of that service for the conveyance of mails for the Dominion. If the day of sailing of the direct Canadian steamers remains Thursday, as at present, I anticipate that it will be advantageous to send a considerable portion of the mid-week mails for Canada by them.

Government Education Grants Allocation.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in view of his statement that a Bill will be introduced next year dealing with the allocation of Government grants in aid of education, he can say how many meetings the Departmental Committee, appointed in October, 1905, to consider the incidence of the local cost of education in heavily rated areas, has held; when the Committee last met, and when it will meet again; what evidence, if any, it has taken, and whether it proposes to call further evidence; and whether he will consider the advisability, in view of the large questions opened up by the promise of a Bill next year, of widening the terms of reference of this Committee, and strengthening its constitution.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): I understand that the Committee has obtained Returns from the local education authorities, and proposes shortly to submit an interim Report. The Committee has not, however, taken any oral evidence and as at present advised does not propose to do so before submitting its interim Report. It has met about eight times, the last occasion being on June 21st. I will give careful consideration to the suggestion at the conclusion of the hon. Member's Question, but it is not at present decided what functions that Committee will fulfil in relation to the preparation of a new scheme of grants.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in view of his statement that a Bill will be introduced next year dealing with the dispensation of Government grants for education and the allocation of the new million of grant for which provision is made under Clause 12 of the present Education Bill, he will state what special aid grants will remain available for heavily rated areas during the financial year 1906–7.

MR. BIRRELL: All the existing grants, including the recent new grant for local authoritities with exceptionally high education rates, will be continued in respect of any given area until the new scheme of grants comes into operation in respect of that area.

Medical Officers to Education Authorities.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can inform the House of the number and names of the education authorities which have appointed a medical officer.

MR. BIRRELL: I must refer the hon. Member to the information given in the

Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Medical Inspection and Feeding of Children (Command Paper 2779), beyond which I have no information on the point referred to.

Control of State-Aided Schools.

MR. J. F. MASON (Windsor): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in the case of a State-aided school, the persons recognised by the Board of Education as the responsible body of managers of the school will have the control of the school, or whether the school will be under the control of the local education authority.

MR. BIRRELL: The managers will have the control, subject to the Board of Education.

School Hours.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether school hours include the whole time during which a school is open under the discretion of the local authority, or only the time set apart for secular instruction.

MR. BIRRELL: The phrase "school hours" does not occur in the Education Bill, and the Answer to the Question must depend upon the meaning attached by the hon. Member to that phrase. As I have no information on this, I cannot answer the Question. If he will put upon the Paper a more specific Question I will endeavour to give him a reply.

Training College Students and Vaccination.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been drawn to the condition imposed by training colleges that, before admission, students must bring certificates of successful revaccination on coming into residence; and whether, in view of the general law, he will represent to the college authorities the desirability of recognising the conscientious objections that students may have to vaccination.

*MR. BIRRELL: My attention has not, until now, been drawn to the point; but I will see that the attention of training college authorities is drawn to the fact that the Board of Education will not withhold recognition from unvaccinated persons (otherwise qualified) as teachers, where the person has a conscientious objection to vaccination and the local authority concur in such recognition. The college authorities shall be put in the same position towards their students in this regard as the local authority is put towards their teachers, as I have explained.

Galway Sessional Divisions.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that at the Galway quarter sessions an appeal on the part of Peter Duggan from the decision of magistrates sitting at petty sessions was disallowed on the ground of the failure of his counsel to appear at the Tuam quarter sessions, which were held first; that the decision in question imposed costs upon the appellant; that, as the divisions of the county for court purposes now stand, people from near Loughrea have to go to Tuam; whether he can say if representations to have the divisions altered have been made to the Government by the Recorder and the Bar of Galway; and will he say what steps the Government propose taking to remedy the grievance complained of.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): I am informed by the Recorder of Galway that the appeal referred to was disallowed on the ground that it should have been brought at Tuam quarter sessions, which were the first sessions in the division. No costs were given by the court of quarter sessions at Galway against the appellant. The Recorder states that it is not the case that people near Loughrea have to go to Tuam quarter sessions; Tuam and Loughrea are in different divisions of the county. The Recorder is of opinion that the present divisions are somewhat inconvenient and might be altered with advantage to the public. No representations on the subject have been made for some years past; but in 1900 the Recorder, acting on representations made by the solicitors of the county, proposed changes in the existing divisions of the county. Effect, however, could not be given to these proposals because they involved the subdivision of parishes, which the law officers advised could not be legally carried out. The Lord-Lieutenant in Council has power to make changes in quarter sessions' divisions, and any memorial on the subject will be sure to receive due consideration.

Irish Land Purchase—Dissatisfied Tenants.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of cases in which tenants, dissatisfied with the terms of sale offered to them, have been compelled, under Section 19 of the Land Act of 1903, to buy their holdings on those terms; will the Report of the Estates Commissioners show these cases; and when will that Report be ready.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): The Estates Commissioners inform me that in no case up to March 31st, 1906, has a tenant been compulsorily declared a purchaser under Section 19 of the Act. The forthcoming Report of the Commissioners, which they hope to submit during the present month, will contain a reference to the working of the section.

Evicted Farms and Untenanted Lands.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if evicted farms not let permanently to any tenant are included in the Return of untenanted land; if the Estates Commissioners have in the case of all such farms for which there are eligible applicants asked the owners to sell those farms; and if he will consider the advisability in the public interest of publishing all such replies as are refusals to sell.

MR. BRYCE: The Commissioner of Valuation who prepared the Return informs me that the Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative, assuming that the landlords are entered as occupiers in the valuation lists. The Estates Commissioners inform me that they intend to inquire from the owners of all untenanted land which consists of evicted farms whether they are willing to sell. As to the concluding part of the Question, I beg to refer to my Answer to the hon. Member on May 28th. †

Purchase Agreements at Excessive Prices.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, since it is not the policy of the present Government to allow the value of tenancies, under the Land Act of 1881, to be confiscated in transactions under the Land Act of 1903, and the Government are willing to have this question raised for judicial decision, will he explain why it has not been so raised in any one of the cases in which tenants have refused to sign purchase agreements on the ground of excessive price.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that in the case supposed by the hon. Member no concrete question of law as to the equity of the price agreed upon could arise, seeing that in the case as supposed by him it is assumed that no price has been agreed upon. It would, in the Commissioners' opinion, be impossible to refer to the Judicial Commissioners as a question of law the reasonableness or otherwise of a tenant's refusal to sign an agreement to purchase his holding.

Local Government Inspectors.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant the Return of Local Government Inspectors now on the Notice Paper; and, in the event of refusing any of the information asked, will he state reasons for the refusal.

The Return was as follows:—

Local Government Inspectors (Ireland), Return of all the Inspectors now in the service of the Local Government Board, showing in respect of each, (1) his name; (2) where educated; (3) date of original appointment; (4) age on appointment; (5) whether he obtained the appointment by competitive examination, by nomination, or by nomination and examination; (6) if nomination, name of nominator; (7) occupation previous to appointment; (8) experience of local government previous to appointment; (9) present salary; (10) travelling and other expenses in latest completed year of service; (11) amount of pension, if any, to which in normal course he will become entitled.

MR. BRYCE: I am prepared to give this Return in a slightly amended form.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 81.

Some of the information asked for is not available. I will communicate to the hon. Member the amendments which I would propose.

Tenants Improvements.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when in the case of a tenanted estate an originating application for its sale is preceded by negotiations prolonged by the unwillingness of tenants to buy on the landlord's terms, and at length three-fourths are overcome by pressure, do the Estates Commissioners, before compelling any reluctant tenant to buy, under Section 19 of the Land Act of 1903, ascertain the value of his occupation interest and improvements, and deduct the amount from the gross value in order not to compel him to buy what is already his own property.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that in the case of an originating application for the sale of an estate which the tenants have agreed to purchase direct from the landlord, all the tenants on the estate as declared under Section 98 must agree to purchase before the sale can be carried through. The requirement as to three-fourths of the tenants agreeing to purchase has no reference to such sales. It applies only to sales to the Land Commission under Section 6 of the Act. In the case of sales under Section 6 to the Land Commission, the Commissioners in each case require a report as to the tenants improvements and the value thereof, and the gross and net fair rents; and in estimating the price a deduction is made from the gross value in respect of tenants improvements. The Commissioners do not require a report as to the value of the tenant's occupation interest, and no separate deduction is made in respect thereof. In cases in which the Commissioners purchase an estate it is their practice before compelling any reluctant tenants to buy under Section 19, to obtain a report as to the circumstances in accordance with the instructions to inspectors.

Irish Land Commission Procedure.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will inform the House on what statutory provision does the Irish Land Commission base its claim to charge a tenant for a greater acreage of land than he holds, to set aside the sworn evidence of competent surveyors after a chain survey, and the decision of a county court on that evidence, and adopt instead the unsworn estimate of one who did not survey the farm.

MR. BRYCE: The Land Commission inform me that they do not make any claim to charge, and do not charge, a tenant for a greater acreage of land than he holds. In any case of appeal from the decision of the county court the Land Commission consider the decision of that court, also the evidence produced on both sides and the report of the assessor, and decide judicially upon the case. The decision of the Land Commission on appeal is final, but the court always considers any application which may be made to it to rescind a decision already made.

MR. GINNELL: As a matter of fact, has the man in such a case any remedy? After the area has been certified by the County Court Judge it is never surveyed by anybody else.

MR. BRYCE: It is a question of law; but I believe there have been a good many cases in which, after a decision has been given, fresh material facts have been brought forward. In such cases the Commission are prepared to re-open the matter.

Elphin United Irish League Meeting.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at a meeting of the United Irish League, at Elphin, on April 15th last, which was presided over by Mr. T. Rorke, J.P., Mr. John Dowd and Mr. John Shanley were denounced for having taken eleven months farms; Whether he is aware that Sergeant Healy, of Elphin, was present at that meeting, and that on April 17th, Mr. John Dowd reported to Sergeant Healy that Mr. T. Rorke, J.P., had threatened to make it hot for him; whether he is aware that Sergeant Healy advised Mr. Dowd to report the matter to the Lord Chancellor; that Sergeant Healy has, on several occasions, cautioned certain persons for annoying Mr. Dowd; and whether he will inquire as to whether the persons named are receiving adequate protection from the police.

*MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the police authorities that at the meeting in question reference was made to the taking of farms on the eleven months system, but the names of Messrs. Dowd and Shanley were not mentioned, nor was any illegal language used. Sergeant Healy was present at the meeting. Mr. Dowd did not report to the sergeant that Mr. Rorke had threatened to make it hot for him, nor did the sergeant advise Mr. Dowd to report the matter to the Lord Chancellor. It is the fact that Sergeant Healy has cautioned persons against annoying Mr. Dowd, and the desired effect was produced. As I stated in reply to the hon. Member's former Question, Mr. Dowd has not been boycotted nor has he, so far as the police are aware, suffered any inconvenience. The persons named will receive any protection which may be necessary.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): Why should Sergeant Healy or any other policeman attend these meetings of the United Irish League, seeing that the police do not attend meetings of the Orange Society at which disloyal references are made?

*MR. BRYCE: I am not aware that any distinction is made. I do not know whether this meeting was public or not. The police do not attend private meetings, but, of course, if they have reason to believe anything is going to be said by any person belonging to any political party or creed which may make it desirable to report them, they would attend any meeting which they have a right to attend.

MR. LONSDALE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Orangemen entirely repudiate the statements made regarding them?

MR. HAYDEN: Is any hon. Member of this House justified in making charges of the character contained in this Question, which are entirely without foundation—charges really of a criminal character?

*MR. SPEAKER: I always deprecate charges being made against anybody. I confess I did not think there was anything very serious in this Question, or I should have taken steps to prevent its being asked.

MR. HAYDEN: Will the hon. Member withdraw the charge?

MR. LONSDALE claimed he had as much right to put a Question based on positive information as the hon. Member had to make imputations against Orange lodges.

Cornamona School Teacher.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has yet received any report from the senior inspector, giving the results of his investigation of the complaint alleging that Michael O'Malley, principal teacher in Cornamona National School, county Galway, produced at the time of his appointment a certificate of age which did not relate to himself.

*MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the Commissioners of National Education that they have received the Report of their senior inspector upon this case, and that, as a result of the investigation, Mr. O'Malley has resigned his position as principal of Cornamona National School.

Craughwell Evicted Farm.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at Craughwell, county Galway, on Monday night, June 4th, the dwelling-house of a Mrs. Ryan was attacked and the windows broken; whether the cause of this attack was that Mrs. Ryan occupied a farm from which the former tenant was evicted many years ago; and what steps he proposes to take to protect defenceless women from such attacks.

*MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the police authorities that on May 30th last (not June 4th) a stone was thrown through Mrs. Ryan's shop window by someone who ran away. The reason for throwing the stone is not known to the police. It is the case that Mrs. Ryan took an evicted farm with the consent of the former tenant, but she is stated by the police to be quite popular in the district, and there is no necessity for affording her any special protection.

Dr. Douglas Hyde.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Dr. Douglas Hyde, who has been selected as a member of the Dublin University Commission, was an unsuccessful candidate for the Chair of Irish in Trinity College; whether there is now in circulation a Gaelic League pamphlet, purporting to have been written by Dr. Douglas Hyde, in which statements are made, contrary to the facts, that the Irish Society paid the Professor of Irish for proselytising purposes, and accusations are brought against Trinity College of meanness and conspiracy; and whether, in view of this pamphlet, he proposes to allow him to continue to investigate the affairs of the college.

*MR. BRYCE: I understand that Dr. Douglas Hyde was a candidate for the Chair of Irish in Trinity College, Dublin, but was not chosen by the trustees in whom the appointment is vested. I have seen the pamphlet in question and cannot accept as at all accurate or fair the description applied to it by the hon. Member. I find in it no ground why Dr. Hyde should not be a member of the Commission appointed to inquire into Trinity College. It is no doubt written with some warmth of expression, but such warmth naturally belongs to pamphlets on Celtic literature. It furnishes ample proof of Dr. Hyde's loyal regard for his own university and his desire to see its usefulness extended and its ancient fame maintained.

In putting the Question Mr. LONSDALE suggested that this too would afford the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity for displaying his facetiousness.

MR. BRYCE asked the Speaker if the hon. Member was in order in making observations of that kind.

*MR. SPEAKER: I did not catch the observation, but an hon. Member is only entitled to ask Questions and not at the same time to comment on preceding Answers.

MR. LONSDALE: The facetiousness to which I referred was distinctly conveyed in the right hon. Gentleman's Answer which was quite outside the point of my Question.

*MR. SPEAKER: It was not in order for the hon. Member to comment on that.

*MR. BRYCE: I am sorry if I gave offence to the hon. Member by my reply. I am not aware of having perpetrated the smallest possible joke. My Answer was a simple statement of fact.

Earl of Leitrim's Donegal Estate.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board are in negotiation for the purchase of that portion of the Donegal estate of the Earl of Leitrim which lies in the district of Falcarragh; and whether they have considered the advisability of purchasing at the same time other small estates in the immediate vicinity, in pursuance of the policy of grouping small estates and carrying out upon them a general scheme of improvement and development which is indicated on page 17 of the 14th Report of the Congested Districts Board for the year ending March 31st, 1905.

MR. BRYCE: The Congested Districts Board are in negotiation for the purchase from Lord Leitrim of the townland of Dunmore, which appears to be the property referred to in the Question. The small estates referred to have not been offered to the Board, but they will take any opportunity which may arise of carrying out their policy of grouping estates for improvement purposes.

Irish Land Sub-Commissioners.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say how many Sub-Commissioners whose term of office expired have been valuing lands for the landlords in the South of Ireland and giving evidence before the Sub-Commissioners and the Land Commissioners' Court in land cases, and how many gave evidence before Mr. Justice Fitzgerald in Limerick recently; whether their valuations in such cases have been in almost all cases higher than the old rents the tenants were paying; and whether, when these men were appointed Commissioners, he can say it was on the ground of competency to determine the value of land.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the Land Commission that it would be impossible, even after a very protracted inquiry, to state definitely the number of cases in which gentlemen who had formerly served as Assistant Commissioners have been produced as witnesses before Sub Commission or appeal courts. The Land Commission are, however, aware that at the recent sittings of the Land Commission in Limerick and Kerry, Mr. Croasdale was produced as a valuer on behalf of the landlord in a few cases, and Mr. C. H. Bolster was produced as a valuer on behalf of the tenant in one case. These gentlemen were formerly Assistant Commissioners, but neither had acted as such in the cases in which they were produced as valuers. These cases are still pending for judgment, and the Judicial Commissioner concerned does not think it right to discuss the evidence. Messrs. Croasdale and Bolster were appointed Assistant Commissioners by the executive Government in 1899 and 1896, respectively, and it was then, as now, a condition of the appointment of such officers that they should possess a practical acquaintance with the value of land in Ireland.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked if a certain Sub-Commissioner had not given evidence before Mr. Justice Fitzgerald?

MR. BRYCE: I do not know.

Police Protection Post at Corracunna.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to a resolution of the Michelstown Board of Guardians regarding the police protection post at Corracunna, county Cork; and whether, seeing that this police post is situated in the midst of a peaceful district, where any form of crime, agrarian or otherwise, is absolutely unknown, he will take such action as may be necessary for its discontinuance, and further direct that the expenses connected with its maintenance hitherto shall not fall upon the ratepayers of the district.

*MR. BRYCE: My attention has been called to the resolution in question. The protection post at Corracunna was established to provide for the protection of the caretaker of a farm as to which there is a dispute. The police authorities consider the protection post to be still necessary, but it will be discontinued as soon as the circumstances may permit. The cost does not fall upon the ratepayers.

Corracunna Farm Dispute.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Estates Commissioners has been called to the dispute respecting the farm at Corracunna, on the Kingston estate; and if he will represent to the Commissioners the necessity for effective steps being taken by them to bring about an equitable settlement of the matter when carrying out the sale of this estate.

*MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that their attention has not been called to the dispute mentioned by the hon. Member, which, indeed does not appear to be a dispute as to land purchase. The lands referred to are not the subject of any proceedings pending before the Commissioners.

Barna Pier, County Galway.

MR. CHARLES DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether in view of the condition of Barna pier, county Galway, and the services such a pier in good condition could render the fishermen of Barna, he will ask the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries to send an inspector to examine it; and whether he will have an allocation of money made to put it in good order.

*MR. BRYCE: The Department of Agriculture will have Barna pier inspected as soon as the current work of the Department may permit.

Irish Land Valuations—Complaint against Mr. Lionel Croasdale.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that Mr. Lionel Croasdale, whose term of office as Assistant Sub-Commissioner recently expired, valued land for a landlord, General Lloyd, in the county of Limerick, and used an official postcard of the Land Commission, notifying the tenant Richard Sheehy, that he was to inspect the holding on a date mentioned and asking him to attend, and thus led him into the belief that he was a Commissioner; and whether he will take steps to see that these official postcards be not used by any ex-Sub-Commissioner in future.

*MR. BRYCE: I have referred this Question to the Land Commission, who inform me that they will make enquiries into the matter.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Did the right hon. Gentleman receive the postcard?

*MR. BRYCE: Yes, and I have sent it to the Land Commission for their observations.

Glensharrold Estate, County Limerick.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether Mr. James O'Grady Delmege has made application under the Land Act, 1903, to the Estates Commissioners to purchase his estate at Glensharrold, in the county of Limerick; and whether, having regard to the fact that there is grazing land and a number of tenants of uneconomic holdings on this mountainous property, they will, in the event of purchase, divide these lands amongst them to carry out the object of the Act with respect to such holdings.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that Mr. Delmege has not up to the present instituted proceedings for the sale to them of his estate. If, however, the Commissioners should purchase the estate, they will, when dividing the untenanted land, have due regard to the wants of the tenants.

Delmege Estate, County Limerick.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether in the case of James Quilty, evicted tenant on the O'Grady Delmege estate at Grouselodge, in the county of Limerick, the Estates Commissioners have received his application for reinstatement; and, if so, whether they will direct the attention of their inspector to this case with a view to his reinstatement.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners have received from James Quilty an application for reinstatement, and will have the case duly enquired into by their inspector.

Glensharrold Evicted Tenants.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received application for reinstatement from Mrs. Margaret Windle, evicted tenant on the O'Grady Delmege estate at Glensharrold; and, if so, whether they have yet taken any steps to have her reinstated.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners have received Mrs. Windle's application, but have not yet been able to take any steps in the matter. They are, however, referring the case to their inspector for enquiry and report.

Dublin Corporation and the Local Government Auditor.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Resolution passed by the Dublin Corporation on July 6th reiterating their determination not to allow Mr. Drury, the Local Government Board auditor, access to their books, notwithstanding the order of the Court of King's Bench; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. BRYCE: I have no knowledge of the Resolution referred to beyond what I have gathered from the newspapers. The matter is before the Courts, and I do not, as at present advised, see that any steps on the part of the Executive Government are called for.

Ballylongford Evicted Tenant.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: On behalf of the hon. Member for North Kerry I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received applications from Mrs. Kate Scanlan, of Tullihinnell, Ballylongford, in the county of Kerry, evicted tenant on the estate of M. V. Blacke Douglas, for reinstatement in her holding; and whether, having regard to the fact that the estate is being sold under the Land Act, 1903, and that Mr. Figgis, solicitor, Dublin, is in occupation of the lands, they will direct their inspector in the county of Kerry to inquire at once into this case and take steps to have her reinstated.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement of the former tenant mentioned, and have referred it to one of their inspectors for enquiry and report.

Carriekerry (Limerick) Postal Arrangements.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, in the public interest and to the convenience of local traders, he will consider the establishing of a rural post office in the village of Carriekerry, in the county of Limerick, with a weekly service of letters instead of having only a pillar box there, as it is difficult and sometimes impossible to obtain stamps for urgent communications, and the present system of five days postal service extending over a large area is inadequate.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have called for a Report on this subject, and I will send the hon. Member an Answer in due course.

Welsh Church Inquiry.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether any State inquiry by commission or otherwise was made into the condition and temporalities of the Established Church in Wales, or into the position of the free churches, prior to the introduction of the Welsh Disestablishment Bills of 1894 and 1895; whether the recent appointment of a Royal Commission bears any relation to the proposed early introduction of a measure to terminate the Established Church in Wales; and, if so, what is the change of circumstance that has necessitated an inquiry.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): No inquiry by Royal Commission or otherwise was made into the condition and temporalities of the Established Church in Wales before the introduction of the Bills to which my hon. friend refers. That omission was, in my opinion, a somewhat unfortunate one, because, owing to the absence of official information on the questions which have now been submitted to a Royal Commission, the Government of the day were exposed to a good deal of embarrassment in the framing and conduct of the measure. As I have already more than once intimated we hope to legislate on this subject, and we are anxious to obtain the Report of this Commission at an early date as it would be of material assistance.

Education Vote.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S. W.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister when it is proposed to take the Vote for the Board of Education.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand that there is little new to discuss on this Vote, and I cannot imagine that the House of Commons in present circumstances has a large appetite for educational details. I think then that we may for once forego the regular meal in view of the large and ample diet provided by the Education Bill.

Transvaal Self Government and Coolie Importation.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Prime Minister what is the earliest date at which His Majesty's Government expects that responsible government will be established in the Transvaal capable of dealing with the outrages committed by the Chinese; and whether the time limit for further importation of Chinese will ensure that all importation shall have ceased at least one month before the granting of responsible government.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Responsible government cannot be fully established before the beginning of next year and the time limit has been fixed with the object of ensuring that importation shall be over before the responsible government commences.

Women's Suffrages.

DR. SHIPMAN (Northampton): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is intended to take Government business only during the autumn sitting; and, if so, will he include in such business the Local Authorities (Qualification of Women) Bill, concerning which he has stated that the Government will, if an opportunity offers of facilitating its progress, gladly avail themselves of it.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have nothing to add to the Answer to which my hon. friend refers.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked what would be the course of business after Thursday.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said it had been his intention to take the Trades Disputes Bill on Friday, but as it had been already put down for Monday that was impossible. He therefore proposed on Friday to move the suspension of the Standing Orders relating to the sittings of the House, in order to ease the proceedings of the House for the rest of this portion of the session. It might be said that this was a little earlier than usual, to which he would reply that the session began later than usual, and that they proposed to close this portion of the session earlier than usual. He thought, therefore, that it was a not unreasonable request. After he had made this Motion on Friday he proposed to take the Agricultural Vote. On Thursday, the 19th instant, the Votes for the Local Government Board and the Board of Trade would be taken, and on Friday, the 20th, the Indian Budget. On Thursday, the 26th, Irish Estimates would be taken, and on Friday, the 27th, the remaining Navy Votes. The next Votes to be taken after that would be those of the Colonial Office and the Home Office.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he had considered that neither as regarded the Education Bill nor Supply was there any advantage in suspending the 11 o'clock rule, since the first was provided for under the guillotine Resolution, while Supply was provided for by the Standing Orders. According to the Government's pledge, their time up to August 4th was to be given to the Education Bill and Supply, and he should like to know what measure the Government proposed to further by the suspension of the 11 o'clock rule.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the one fact affecting the position of next Friday was that the Committee stage of the financial Resolutions on which to found the Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, ought to be agreed to, in order to enable the Bill to proceed before the Standing Committee. They hoped to take that on Friday. Of course, the Government held themselves bound to proceed with all their Bills when most convenient to the House.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said the question would arise whether that statement was in accordance with the pledge that had been given. But had the right hon. Gentleman considered that he could not pass other Bills on Supply nights, and could only do so on Education nights? Was his view that, after closing the discussion on the Education Bill, they should at a late hour pass other legislation on the same nights?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he understood that on Supply nights they could take other Bills if the eleven o'clock rule were suspended.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that, if the right hon. Gentleman would look at the rule, he would see that that was not so.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that, inasmuch as the formal Resolution in Ways and Means of the Labourers' Bill had been blocked night after night by the friends of the right hon. Gentleman, he hoped the Government would have no scruple whatever, in asking the House to sit later on Education and Supply nights to push on business.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he had objected to the Labourers (Ireland) Bill being sent to a Committee upstairs, but, since that point had been settled, he had no objection to the Resolution being taken. Was it simply that this Bill might be passed that the right hon. Gentleman proposed to suspend the eleven o'clock rule?

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: The Resolution was blocked last night by the hon.

Member for Hammersmith, and the senior Member for Dublin University—also a follower of the right hon. Gentleman—refused to appeal to the hon. Member to withdraw his objection.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Well, I have no objection to the Resolution being passed. But is it proposed to suspend the rule for that only?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) asked when the Treasury Vote would be taken.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he could not name a day.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added the following Member to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures: Mr. William Redmond.

Report to lie upon the Table.

FATAL ACCIDENTS AND SUDDEN DEATHS INQUIRY (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Trade, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 249.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 249.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 306.]

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Sixth Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Mr. John Redmond.

NEW BILLS.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) BILL.

"To enable Regulations to be made for the prevention of danger arising to Public Health from the importation, preparation, storage, or distribution of articles of Food," presented by Mr. John Burns; supported by Mr. Runciman; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 307].

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair].

Clause 25:—

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the Clause."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

Question, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill," put forthwith, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, and negatived.

Clause 26:—

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said that by Clause 26 it was intended to adopt the principle of devolution or the delegation of certain powers to the local education authority. He proposed to say a few words upon the general principles of the delegation which the clause covered. A very large number of Members greatly regretted the loss of the school board system under the Bill of 1902, and their opinion was shared by a very considerable number of educationists throughout the land. The loss certainly lessened the power of local control, and also the interest of the parents in the schools, because parents became wholly disassociated from the work. No doubt, under the old system, there were many parish schools which were inefficient; but at the same time, there were a great many which were very effective; and, generally speaking, the school board system did secure a considerable amount of local control which the Act of 1902 failed to maintain. It was because of this that the Government were induced to frame Clause 26. He thought the working of the Act of 1902 had fully justified the foreboding which was held in many quarters with respect to it. The areas of many of the counties were far too large for practical control, and were also very difficult of access, and in many counties local authorities met under circumstances which did not give them full power to exercise any genuine control over the work in the local areas. Local authorities, therefore, were not in that direct touch with the work in their educational areas which it was desirable should be the case. Nor had they sufficient time to perform the duties appertaining to the schools, the result being that the Act had largely to be worked by officials. He did not wish to speak in anything but terms of the highest respect for these officials, who no doubt did their work conscientiously; but still they did not and could not take the place of the local authority. He thought it would be universally admitted that the boards of managers acting under these local authorities were an absolute farce. Clergymen and others had complained to him that boards of managers could not even order a slate pencil or determine that a window should be mended. Such a state of things simply reduced their work to a farce. That, however, was the position of a great many of the boards of management in various parts of the country, and consequently these managers had ceased to be any force whatever in the educational system of the country. Of course many on the Ministerial side of the House would prefer that the Government should go back to the *ad hoc* system; but, at the same time, they fully admitted the difficulties of such a course, and therefore could not unduly press it. Failing this, however, some general system of delegation should be adopted by the Committee. Ministerialists were of opinion that the county council should be compelled to delegate some portion of their control to local authorities, and further that county councils should have power to adopt schemes variable in their nature—as it was most desirable they should be, because the different counties of the kingdom were variable in their character and pursuits, the feeling of the inhabitants were different, and in many other ways did they vary—all of which showed that a hard and fast scheme of a uniform character should not be made to apply to every county. Therefore, if the Amendments were carried, committees would be able to adopt their own schemes. He thought that more financial responsibility should be placed upon managers in local areas in order that they might feel that their management was a real and genuine work and not the farce which at present existed. He hoped the Amendments would be considered as educational in character and not calculated to engender that bitterness which had existed with regard to some Amendments which had been considered. Those who had had experience of county council management in educational matters in the larger counties would agree that something must be done to make the educational system more complete, that there should be given to parents some direct contact with educational work, and that a more general control should be exercised in the localities. In saying this he did not at all agree that the local area should be an ordinary parish; in fact, in most cases, he thought it should not be so, for it would be too small; but the county county council should be able to apportion the areas. If that were done they would see restored that local control which was such a desirable element in the educational system of the country. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 16, to leave out from the beginning, to the word 'any,' in line 18, and insert the words 'Each county council shall delegate to the council of any borough (other than a metropolitan borough), or of any urban or rural district, or of any parish within the county, or to local education committees constituted in areas as hereinafter provided the exercise of.' "—(*Mr. George White.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'If' stand part of the clause."

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, S.) opposed the Amendment on the ground that it would upset the settlement of 1902. He did not agree with the hon. Member in his statement that the work of the present Act was largely carried out by officials. Under the Act of 1902 there had been an improved attendance of the children at the schools, and that was the main consideration in an education authority's work. The salaries of teachers had also improved. There had been an improvement in the buildings and an improvement all round under the Act of 1902. He was anxious that this Bill should not break up the settlement which had worked so well and which, he believed, would work better in future. He did not say that there should be no devolution. At present the county council could devolve its powers to smaller areas or groups of areas. In large counties like Yorkshire and Devonshire there was that elasticity. The Amendment said that instead of leaving it to the county council who knew the necessities of their own districts, the county council should break up the county areas and should delegate their powers to small local education authorities. What he wanted to point out was the danger of friction when this dual control was established. It was proposed to reserve to the county council the powers and duties in connection with the engagement, dismissal, and salaries of the teachers, but the powers in regard to the engagement and dismissal of caretakers and the like were to be devolved to the minor authority. As to the question of attendance, he thought that that should be essentially left in the hands of the county authorities. There had been an immense improvement in the attendance of children at the public elementary schools since the passage of the Act of 1902. The attendance officers had been very active and local circumstances had not been allowed to hinder them in their work. He contended, therefore, that it would be a reactionary step to put back the control of attendance into the hands of the guardians, who would probably hand it over to the relieving officer in his odd time. He admitted that there was some demand for devolution; but it depended on two things whether the devolution might suit the county council. It should be left to the county council to settle in what manner it should be made; it should not be made mandatory upon them. Then the division of the powers between the county council and the minor authorities should be most carefully thought out. What the parents in a village were really interested in was the choice of a teacher, and not in the appointment of caretakers and the like. At least that was his experience in all the counties with which he was connected. The county area was too large for this, and in no case of which he knew where the parishes had agreed to be grouped had the appointment of the teachers been made in opposition to the wishes of the parishes or villages concerned. The right form of devolution was, therefore, to give some choice in the selection of the teachers, subject, of course, to the supervision of the county council. That could easily be done without breaking up the present organisation under the Act of 1902. He had put down an Amendment that four managers of a school should be chosen by the parish and two by the county council; but he had no objection to the whole six being chosen by the parents. He was not an enemy of devolution, and he was anxious to see some scheme of devolution, but if education was to be advanced and if the progress made under the Act of 1902 was to be maintained the county council should remain supreme. Only in that way would a pure administration be secured.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he wished to ask the hon. Member for N.W. Norfolk to explain one or two points which were rather obscure. The hon. Gentleman had said he desired to substitute a general policy of compulsion for the policy of limitation set forth lower down in the Bill. What he wished to know was whether the hon. Gentleman wanted the limitation to extend to the appointment and the salaries of the teachers?

Mr. GEORGE WHITE: Yes.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The second question he wished to ask was, had the hon. Gentleman put in his Amendment that this compulsory delegation was to take place without any express wish on the part of the areas referred to. The Amendment ran thus—

> "The county council shall delegate to local education committees constituted in areas as hereinafter provided."

It did not require that there should be any demand from the places to which the delegation was to be made. It was to be compulsory. But if that was the plan, who was to settle the unit on which the delegation was to be conferred? Was it to be a compulsory delegation on every parish, or was it to be left to the county council to say whether they should go to a parish, or group of parishes; and for the county council to decide how big that group of parishes was to be? A group might be half a county. If the county council was to be compelled to make a delegation there must be some superior authority to say to whom the delegation was to take place.

MR. GEORGE WHITE said that he had purposely not entered into details. If the Government accepted the principle of devolution there would have to be a new clause which would fill up the details of the scheme and cover the ground. His idea was that the county council should be compelled to make a scheme after inquiry.

*DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he rejoiced that the Committee were having a discussion on a strictly educational question—the first during these long debates. The Act of 1870 had this defect, that it took the rural parishes out of the local administration of education. There was no doubt that many village school boards did efficiently very difficult work under difficult circumstances; but, on the other hand, many of them were highly inefficient, partly because the areas were so small and rateable values so low that the burden was enormous just where the estimate of the value of education was the lowest. Notwithstanding the eulogy of his hon. friend the Member for South Birmingham, the Act of 1902 had, in his judgment, swung the pendulum in the other direction. Under that Act in large counties like Yorkshire, Devonshire, Glamorganshire and Hampshire the control of education had become absolutely bureaucratised and had fallen almost entirely into the hands of a far too powerful body of officials. Education was a thing which could only flourish in an area of public concern, and the moment one took it away from public concern and put it beyond that, official action would sterilise it and public interest was taken away. Local interest in a good many administrative counties was so killed under the Act of 1902. Two means had been devised to remedy this state of things. The first was Clause 26 proposed by his right hon. friend. Undoubtedly the spirit of that clause was an attempt to try to remedy the extent to which the pendulum swung too far in 1902. Then there was the new clause of his hon. friend the Member for Middleton. Clause 26 compelled the county council to allow so small an area as the parish autonomy on demand, but he did not himself think that so small an area ought to be allowed to demand autonomy at all. The demand ought to come from the authority of the superior area. In that respect he thought that Clause 26 was faulty. If the parish was a rich one, it would consider that its rateable area and the value of it was above that of the county generally, and they would endeavour to get out of their communal obligations. They might also go out because of trouble with the county authority. Of course the superior authority should have a big voice in the settlement of the area, and Clause 26 reserved powers and duties connected with the engagement, dismissal, and salaries of teachers. That was an admirable reservation, and he was glad to see it incorporated in the proposed new clause of his right hon. friend. He hoped the administration of Section 74 of the Act of 1870 would also be reserved. He could not look with any equanimity upon any scheme of devolution which would allow a parish council to fix its own standards of exemption or manage its own attendance by-laws. The records of the Board of Education were full of cases in regard to the old village school lands, in which the members of the board illegally employed child labour. Therefore it was necessary to insert safeguards in regard to this point. Mr. Acland and Sir John Gorst had had to deal with this matter. The finance of Clause 26 was difficult, and under it three rates would have to be levied. The proposed new clause was also very involved and intricate, and would, it appeared to him, involve six different financial proceedings. What he thought they really wanted was omitted. They wanted devolution of certain powers to be given to poor law unions alone or in combination or by a district council alone, or a combination of district councils. If they could evolve a practicable scheme they might arouse once again the enthusiasm which had been damped down in the country since the Act of 1902.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said that it would be well to know what was the actual proposal before the Committee, because under the new clause put down in the name of the hon. Member for Middleton, the small local authority would step into the shoes of the county authority for all purposes of elementary education, whereas under the Government's clause they would only step in for the purposes of management.

*MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton), in supporting the Amendment of the hon. Member for N.W. Norfolk, thought the distinction drawn by the hon. Member for Oxford University between the proposal of the Government, the Amendment of the hon. Member for N.W. Norfolk and the new clause which he himself had upon the Paper, although correct, was neither material nor important. If they were allowed to discuss the question of delegation, all the clauses were alike in this respect, that they were all anxious to have in every English county some scheme of delegation subordinate to and regulated by the county authority, and so long as they had a scheme that was subordinate to and directed by the county authority these differences came to nothing. The criticisms of the hon. Member for North Camberwell were criticisms of detail and not of principle. He, himself, supported the clause of the hon. Member for Norfolk. It was agreed in all parts of the House that there was room for some delegation. There was a wide-spread desire for delegation, and there were two ways of bringing it about. One was by a revolutionary measure directed entirely against existing legislation, and the other a measure consistent with existing legislation. The Amendment which he suggested was in the latter direction. He suggested that they should leave, as now, the county council supreme, and put upon it the initiative for a scheme for devolution. Any one who read his clause would find in it very careful provisions to maintain the supremacy of the county council, and that whatever was delegated was subject to their control. But if that was the first step, the second was to give the widest powers of delegation consistent with that supremacy. The hon. Member for N.W. Norfolk believed in a considerable amount of delegation. The needs of the English counties varied enormously according to their geographical features, and if the Government adopted the proposal that each county should draw up a scheme in a certain time, to be fixed by the Bill, it might very well happen that all the devolution required in some of the smaller areas would be a devolution to parish councils of the duties of managers of small parochial matters. But when they came to deal with the larger English counties, it was obvious that the parish council would not be the appropriate authority and there would be a need for greater devolution. The English counties, however, might be trusted to draw up their schemes for devolution and select the authority which was most appropriate to the particular county. First of all they wanted devolution from the county council, but they wanted that devolution to representative bodies in order that the people who exercised it might not only help the county council, but be directly responsible to the area for the work they did. That was the second principle of devolution which they laid down, and of which he hoped his right hon. friend would approve. The third principle was that when this was done it ought to be only after full public inquiry. It was one of the customs of the English people to grumble, and if the people were given an opportunity to state their grievances early in matters of this kind, they would be far more likely to have a good scheme. With regard to financial matters, the alleged computations of the hon. Member for North Camberwell did not carry weight, because the six different kinds of rates were alternatives not cumulative and could not all fall on any one spot in these islands. His own contention was that if they delegated authority to a representative body after public inquiry, that representative body ought to have some financial responsibility. He hoped the Government would accept the suggestion to give to the locality some financial responsibility, and that they would feel that the proper method of devolution was not to draw one hard and fast line all over the country, but one which would leave each county council free to provide for its own needs. He did not suggest that every detail of the clause was approved by the County Councils Association, but the executive committee of the Association by a considerable majority had recently approved of the scheme's being universal and compulsory without distinction. They also thought it might be applied to authorities *ad hoc* as well as to municipal authorities. There had long been jealousy between the *ad hoc* and the municipal principle, and here he submitted was an opportunity of testing both methods. On that ground alone he believed this would be a wise educational experiment. It was imperative now without delay to have such a devolution throughout the country as would stimulate local interest and yet maintain the county council supremacy. He therefore supported the Amendment, and he earnestly asked the Government to adopt the substance of the clause which he had put down.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) hoped the Committee would allow him to say a few words on this subject, he having had many years experience in the administration of local affairs in this connection. At the time when the Act of 1902 was before the House, the question partly of delegation, partly of division into districts of large areas was fully discussed, but he did not think the conclusion arrived at was altogether satisfactory. His own experience related mainly to the West Riding of Yorkshire, and he had had almost constant opportunities of observing the difficulties under which that great authority laboured. They were oppressed by the vastness of the area, and by the great diversities and the different conditions of the population, their occupations, their tastes and their needs. At present the condition of affairs was that the West Riding County Council, a most able, a most laborious, and now a most experienced authority, had almost broken down under the multiplicity of details. Allusion had been made to pencils, and some merriment arose in consequence. He did not know what was the fact at the present time, but sometime since the West Riding County Council kept within their control the selection and ordering of all materials. He hoped they had grown wiser since those days of comparative inexperience. While, however, they had the county authority oppressed by these details, those living in the different districts who had the management of the schools day by day felt a bitter sense of their want of power, and a just irritation at the constant interference of an authority at a considerable distance, and so laden with the multiplicity of business that promptitude was extremely difficult. There was a danger that the business might be conducted under iron regulations carried out by officials, highly trained no doubt, but unable from their very position to have regard to the varying needs of the districts. The whole system lacked the elasticity which was absolutely necessary to adapt it to the wants of each locality. He thought the time was come when the House ought to take the matter in hand and relieve education from the difficulties in which it was involved by the present state of affairs. As for the mode of procedure, it was clear there should be in every case searching local inquiry. There must also be some power of review, either by the education authority or the county council itself. In his opinion the initiative ought to be with the county council, and inquiry to be made by them. It ought to be prompt, efficient, and sympathetic, and there should be a final review by the Board of Education in order that the scheme might possess the symmetry which was really necessary. It should be borne in mind that in this country the population moved from county to county, and while having regard to the different wants of different places, they should take care there was such a system, and such sympathy between county and county, that people going from one to another would not feel that they were moving from their own country to a strange land. They should all work under the same system — a system framed with comprehensiveness of view, but also with due proportion and adaptation to the needs of different places.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk) said that one speaker had said, and he thought very truly, that most Members were in favour of some system of delegation; but there was one reason why, in his opinion, delegation of some sort was necessary, which had not been adduced up to now, and that was the rating system. There was no doubt that one of the great objections to the Act of 1902 in agricultural districts had been the fact that a great many small areas had felt that they were paying a rate for education which they ought properly not to be called upon to pay. They had realised that owing to the pooling of the rates for education over so large an area as the county they were paying a rate larger than they would have to pay if they had the management of education in their own area. In the North Riding County Council—which, he thought he might say justly in contradistinction to the West Riding, had certainly tried to administer the Act in the best possible way—a report had been drawn up showing the extent to which this burden of rating fell on local districts owing to the pooling of the rate over so large an area. No fewer than fifteen unions comprised in the district of the county council were paying a larger rate than they would if there were differential rating to defray the expenses of the education given in the schools in the union, and a uniform rate levied over the whole county to defray the central expenses which could not be apportioned. Supposing the county council were to raise a different rate on each union in proportion to the expense incurred in that union, then in the Thirsk Union, for instance, the local rate which they would be called upon to pay would be 1·1d. and the general rate 1·7d. the total rate, therefore, being 2·8d., whereas under existing circumstances they were paying a rate of 5·7d., which showed that that particular union, owing to the pooling of the rate over so large an area, paid almost 3d. in the £ more than it would do if it paid only for the education given in its own area. There was a precedent for such a system of differential rating as he thought would meet the case of delegation under this Act in the police rate, which was levied by a general rate for common expenses, and a special rate for those expenses which fell exclusively on one area. It was the rating inequality which had created a demand, in agricultural districts especially, for some system of devolution, and he was heartily in agreement with that part of Clause 26 which said the county council should charge any expenses incurred in the exercise of those powers or the performance of those duties exclusively in the area of the council to which the powers or duties were delegated. That part of the clause seemed to him in some degree to meet the views he had expressed as to the difference of rating. He would prefer the adoption of a system by which the county council should, purely and simply, be required to levy a differential rate, and that there should not be such a large delegation of powers as was contemplated under Clause 26. It might be urged that if they levied a differential rate on the different unions they must give the unions more power in proportion to the rate they levied upon them, but he was bound to say, in the interests of education in a great many districts, or at all events except in cases such as the West Riding of Yorkshire, that the delegation proposed by Clause 26 would probably not be an advantage to the district. It would be sufficient if, as the hon. Member had suggested, the managers were appointed by, say, the rural district council or some union authority which was selected, and if they were given larger powers than the existing managers had under the Act of 1902. Holding the view that some alteration of the existing rating system was necessary, he was bound to give his support to that part of the clause which altered the rating inequalities, which had been so much complained of in rural districts. At the same time he hoped the Government would not pursue the extreme plan of delegation proposed in Clause 26, because that was a delegation which he thought would be dangerous to the interests of education.

MR. HARVEY (Rochdale) remarked that almost every speaker in the debate had recognised the absolute necessity of a considerable amount of delegation on the part of the county councils. He himself was very strongly in favour of such delegation. He had had the honour to be the chairman of what he believed was the second largest Education Committee in the country since the passing of the Act of 1902; and he had had constantly to lament that his committee had to spend many weary hours in discussing trumpery details, when all its members felt that they ought to be engaged in work for the advancement of education. There were already several powers of delegation under the Act of 1902. For instance, there were the powers of dividing a county area into various parts, and of appointing sub-committees. These powers, however, were not sufficient. If the House would allow a considerable amount of delegation in the educational administration, it would do much good to the county councils themselves, for they would then be able to devote themselves to settling the larger matters of education administration. Delegation if effectively and wisely carried out would also be good for the people of the country. It was essential, if we were to progress educationally, as all desired to do, that the people should have a zeal and enthusiasm for education, which they could never get if the local details of education were sent to distant county towns. At present it was impossible for poor men under any circumstances to be members of county councils. [AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, there are numbers.] That at any rate was his experience. His belief was that by delegating powers to small local subordinate authorities the Committee would not injure or degrade county councils, but would provide a wide field for utility and activity for many men who wanted to be interested in education and to do educational work. He did not view with apprehension the financial objections that had been urged against this course. He had a great and abiding belief in the people of his own country, and believed that England could stand in the forefront educationally, notwithstanding criticism of inefficiency. He preferred an elastic and free system of education far beyond the much flaunted rigid system which obtained in Germany. If the Committee would give the power to promote education in different localities according to the needs of each locality, he believed we should obtain a system of education which would bring our people not many years hence to the front amongst the best educated nations of the world.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the debate was an extremely interesting and important one. There appeared to be on both sides of the House a real desire to increase the powers of delegation existing under the Act of 1902. The Government had not yet made any observations on the Amendment and he thought they were quite right in waiting to see what was the general trend of feeling in the Committee. His remarks were not intended to be critical, but he desired to fix the attention of the Committee on the real difficulties of the problem as they appeared to him. He did not, however, think the rating difficulty or grievance referred to by his noble friend the Member for Thirsk could be met by any practical scheme which was now before the Committee. Was it suggested that if delegations were arranged, the general charges should have a different incidence in different parts of the county? It was understood that the powers delegated should be paid for in the district to which they were delegated; but that would not meet his noble friend's view, nor the views of those who thought that the incidence of rating was very heavy under the Act of 1902. Let the Committee consider what were the powers anybody had yet proposed to delegate. The appointment of teachers, the salaries of teachers and capital charges were not to be delegated. In the circumstances he did not see how delegation would help his noble friend in the object which he very legitimately desired to carry out. Turning to the educational problem, he said he had been somewhat disappointed with what he had heard of the working of the Act of 1902 in some districts, although he had not really had an opportunity of giving the matter sufficient examination to express an opinion of his own. He had heard that councils which had control of education in great rural areas, but on which urban areas had a great preponderance, showed too great indifference to the special needs and wishes of the country districts, and were apt to impose upon them schemes better fitted for urban districts with a kind of universality which perhaps naturally commended itself to a great central authority like the county council. Again, he was not quite sure the Committee had before it any scheme remedying that state of things. Were they going to leave to these bodies the settlement of such questions as attendance, or would the clause be so amended that attendance would be left out?

MR. BIRRELL: Yes, they will have the power of making by-laws.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked if they would also have the power of seeing that the by-laws were properly carried out. That was a real and genuine difficulty. Some of the great authorities, perhaps, had not taken pains to make the curriculum in a village school suited to a country village. Were the Committee sure they would improve that by leaving the village to settle its own curriculum without the county council's having anything to say to it? Appointments, salaries, and by common consent the power of making by-laws as to attendances were excluded, and now it was doubtful whether the curriculum should be delegated. If they excluded the curriculum, all that would be delegated would be the power to buy books and coals and lead pencils. He started with a great desire to see delegation, but when he asked himself how it was to be done, he saw that in the process of delegation they might introduce a system much less favourable to sound education than the system they proposed to amend. He himself rather hoped that the results which they all desired to see from delegation would partly be attained by the use of the powers already given under the Act of 1902. These powers were very wide, and probably they had not been largely used. But they existed, and if they were going to leave the initiative to the county council, he did not see why it should not act under the powers conferred in 1902. It was perfectly true that under those powers they could only delegate to the managers of a school, and that it might be desirable to have larger areas. But they could have larger areas under the Act of 1902. In addition to the powers of delegation referred to by the hon. Gentleman, there were powers under Clause 17 of the 1902 Act. He should have thought that these two parts of the Bill of 1902 gave all the powers wanted.

MR. HARVEY said the powers under Clause 17 of the 1902 Act were not powers of delegation. They were powers which really only allowed a county council to split up its area, if it so desired, into several areas, each of which would be independent.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was not sure that he understood what the hon. Gentleman meant by delegation. He rather thought that the hon. Gentleman meant that the county council was perpetually to hold its authority, and, if it cared, to disapprove of the action of the body to which the delegation had taken place. That was not delegation. The county council was to be relieved of certain of its powers; the powers were to be transferred to somebody else, and the county council was to have no authority to intervene in reference to the details delegated. His first remedy for mitigating over-centralisation—if it existed, and he was inclined to think that it did exist—was to be found in the exercise by the county councils themselves of the great powers which they already possessed under the Act of 1902. He hoped that they would exercise their powers. There was another matter which brought them back to the religious controversy. He would refer to it as briefly as he could. He would like to ask if they were to hand over to the parishes, or groups of parishes, the regulation of the religious instruction. That was a very important point, because if there were pig-headed members on county councils, there would be more of them on the local bodies. He agreed with delegation, but when it came to working out the principle, there were practical difficulties. What the clause at present delegated was very trifling and would not really lighten the labours of the central authority.

MR. STUART (Sunderland) said the Leader of the Opposition had dealt with this subject with great fairness, but he had difficulty in making out whether the right hon. Gentleman did or did not desire a clause in the Bill providing for delegation. He sympathised with the feeling of difficulty which the right hon. Gentleman had in coming to a conclusion on the matter. The general expression of opinion which had been given in the Committee indicated that at this stage it would be very undesirable to come to a definite conclusion upon the form of the clause, and he hoped that the Amendment would be withdrawn and that the Government would undertake to bring forward on the Report stage a clause dealing with the matter. He was entirely in favour of some form of delegation, as everyone must be who had taken part in the work of any great educational body under the Act of 1902. That Act, though objectionable in many respects, had in some ways done a great deal of good. London was not included in the Bill, and he would not enter into details of the work which had come under his notice as a Member of the London County Council. In many respects London stood in a different position from other portions of the country on the matter of education. He would take it that the agricultural Members were favourable to differentiation of the rating on the ground that it would benefit the poorer localities in the counties. Everyone who was acquainted with the question of rating in London knew that if there was a separate system of rating for the different districts, there would be an injury done to the poor. In the county of Norfolk where he resided, he could foresee great difficulties altogether beyond those which had been touched upon by the Leader of the Opposition. Owing to the great distances, there was enormous difficulty in members attending the meetings of the educational authority. One result was that the business was tremendously scamped. An immense number of matters at the end of the agenda paper were left in the hands of officials to settle, or held over to the next meeting. He believed if they could get localised bodies, directly elected for the purpose, to deal with the minor matters of education, it would immensely facilitate the good conduct of business at the centre as well as improve the interest in education in the localities. He admitted that there was a difficulty in knowing where to draw the line in the delegation of work. He had observed that it was little things capable of being left to local bodies which entangled and hindered the central bodies in their work. He ventured to say that if there was nothing delegated except advice as to the curriculum to be adopted in the local schools it would be most valuable. He did not say that the local bodies ought to create and establish finally the curriculum, but they should have the power to represent to the central authority what the curriculum should be from the point of view of the ratepayers in the locality. That was where the method of delegation was superior to the one to which the right hon. Gentleman had pointed, viz., that it should be to the managers. He would much rather delegate the powers even to a body representing a considerable group of areas directly elected than to the school managers. He was very glad that for the moment the religious question had not got its nose into this subject; and he hoped that the Committee would try to keep it out. The discussion which had taken place was perfectly illuminating, and the atmosphere of the House that afternoon was very much to be thankful for. From the point of view of both the central authority and the local bodies, there were great advantages in delegation. It had been said that working men could not sit on the central body, although in many cases—such as the county of Durham—they did. But in the county of Norfolk he knew that they lost the assistance of many men interested in education, who being busy men could not attend the meetings of the central committee in the county town. Their services would be secured in the cause of education if there was delegation. It might be of great advantage if the curriculum were varied from one part of the country to another, and even from one part of a county to another. They must always remember that it was not a good thing to aim at uniformity in education; it was, indeed, desirable to encourage variety.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said that the debate had been a very interesting one. Any person who camefrom a large rural district must approach this subject with a great deal of sympathy. One of the disappointing things connected with the Act of 1902, as he had already pointed out, was that the urban districts had too much dominated the country districts. It was generally found that the members who were appointed to the education committee of the county council were town and not rural members. The result had been that there was now a general feeling that the rural districts were not given that full attention they wished for; and hence there had arisen a demand for delegation of some sort or another. That was particularly the case in regard to the school curriculum, because town and country interests were widely different. In his own county of Kent the agricultural interest should form the larger part of of the curriculum for the children; such as instruction in relation to the hop or fruit industries. The rural members of the county council had not enough influence to induce the education committee of the county council to vary the curriculum so as to instruct the children of their districts in their own branch of agricultural industry. He was quite sure that some means could be found by delegation to give the rural districts power to make representations to the central authority that would be fairly and adequately considered as to changes in the curriculum, or to enable experiments to be made which might be of advantage to these country districts. There was no doubt that the centralisation which followed the Act of 1902 would make the county council reluctant to give up their powers, and had alienated feeling in the country districts which desired greater freedom of local administration. Of course there were certain things which should be left in the hands of the central authority. Coal had been mentioned. He himself had been very much struck at the enormous saving that had been effected in dealing with the supply of coals to the schools by the central authority in a wholesale way and also in regard to the supply of books. Naturally, that was not a very popular thing in the villages. But he thought the Committee should try and discover a means of linking the central and the local authorities and rousing in the latter a greater interest in education. If that could be accomplished, he was sure the Committee would have spent a very useful afternoon.

MR. BIRRELL said that nobody would rejoice more than he did that his foot had been taken from the burning marl of Part I., but he could not feel in paradise in view of the difficulties which surrounded him on the question of delegation. That was a very difficult problem before him. They had had interesting speeches from hon. Gentlemen representing important counties like Lancashire, Norfolk, Northumberland, Yorkshire, Kent, etc., who, without exception, expressed a strong desire in favour of delegation. They all concurred that there was great difficulty in the county councils of these huge counties in discharging at present their educational duties without doing injustice to the rural parts of their areas. They had also heard a great deal about the difficulty of even rich and busy men, as well as poor working men travelling long distances to the county town and spending a whole day every month in attending the meetings of the education committee. He had had constant representations made to him since he came into office on that point. He thought there was, therefore, entire accord in all parts of the House that every thing should be done that could be done in order to break up existing centralisation and to secure to localities some measure of control over the schools in which they were interested, which were at their own doors, and which were attended by their own children. But there was also something else that was clear; and that was that everybody said that the central control ought not to be interfered with; that it was most desirable in the interest of the children themselves that they should not be left to the tender mercies of their own parents or of the village population; that they should be subjected to the wiser rule of a larger body which would concern themselves with their education as a whole. His hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell shuddered at the idea of the awful consequences that would ensue if a particular locality were to frame regulations to secure the attendance at school of their own children. Another hon. Gentleman had said, 'For Heaven's sake do not extend this delegation to the purchase of coal"—probably because coal could be bought in the county town at a far cheaper rate than in a village shop. These were the difficulties that arose between the desire to excite local interest with a certain amount of control and the anxiety that the central authority should maintain, not a dull monotony, but a good equal level of education. Then everybody said that the Minister for Education, or somebody else, should frame a clause to reconcile these two irreconcilable points of view and do equal justice all round. The Minister for Education had certainly been assisted by as hard-working and efficient a staff as ever mortal Minister had, and while he had been engaged over Part I. there was no clause in the Bill to which they had given greater care than this Clause 26. There had also been deputations from local authorities, and Members from either side of the House who had been actively engaged in the administration of the Act of 1902 had contributed much useful information. The general feeling seemed to be that the clause as it stood was defective, as had been pointed out, by giving an initiative to parishes. If one did not know, it might be thought that for the most part the delegated power should be given to those who asked for it; but it seemed to be generally thought that this would not be the proper course to pursue, because the power might pass into the hands of improper persons or be exercised over too small an area, and the responsibility should be imposed on the county council itself. The clause was considered defective in that it did not ensure delegation, but left it to be asked for; and it was said the power might be asked for by those who should not have it and sometimes not asked for by those who should be compelled to take a greater interest in education. The clause was not comprehensive and elastic enough, it was said, and he recognised that there was a good deal of substance in that complaint. That being so, his hon. friend had come to his assistance with a formal, well thought out, and elaborate clause. The great principle of that clause was that there should be an obligation upon the county council to frame a scheme. Everybody agreed that twelve months was entirely inadequate for the purpose; some such period as two years should be substituted. Between his hon. friend's clause and the Government clause there was considerable similarity in the matters to be excluded from the purview of the delegated authority, and these having been enumerated by the Leader of the Opposition, the proposal was open to the formidable criticism of the right hon. Gentleman who said—"What, in the name of Heaven, will be left?" The question of the curriculum was raised, and he could not for a moment think that the Board of Education would hail an intention that it should be left to a delegated authority to determine the curriculum in every school. Anxious as were the country and the Board to consider the wants and feelings of a neighbourhood, and to excite interest in the children in the world around them—and this was the basis of all intelligent education—anxious as the Board were for that, they still wanted to maintain a good level of education, and, though the subjects might vary, the standard of excellence ought not to be allowed to be lowered in any part of the country. The Board would never favour the control of the curriculum by the delegated authority, but agreed that the delegated authority should have a voice in suggesting the curriculum. People were often singularly slow in ideas of their own until they were presented to them, and, unless informed, might assume that the same routine suited all parts of the county. They should not despise the duties that might be delegated because of their limitations, if there was enough in them to stir up local interest and local zeal in the general maintenance and management of schools. Visits to a school, though it did not include the right to appoint or dismiss a teacher, could be best undertaken by people on the spot. [Mr. BALFOUR: As inspectors?] He meant by "visiting the schools" taking an interest in the teaching; he was not thinking so much of inspection, but of taking an interest in the work; and this could be best done by people having right and responsibility by virtue of their representative character. Therefore he assumed there was a desire that an attempt should be made at delegation of certain powers to bodies as varied as possible in character, and not excluding the elective element. Although he quite agreed that it was substantial criticism to say they would have very little to do, yet there might be enough to arouse and maintain local interest in educational work. Here he put in a word for women. Nothing personally gave him more sorrow than the exclusion of women from the administration of the educational work of the country, for they were by common consent among the best members of the old school boards. It was work for which they were eminently fitted, considering the number of female children in our schools, and the whole character and abilities of women lent themselves to educational zeal. Though they could not be elected upon local councils, he hoped there would be no objection if the Government proposal enabled women to play a more useful, responsible part in a great work from which they ought never to have been excluded. He assumed that the Committee would not be indisposed to impose on the education authority an obligation within two years of framing a scheme in the manner indicated in the clause of which his hon. friend had given notice. He took exception to it, however, in one respect. There were small counties, such as Huntingdon and Rutland, where it would be unreasonable to impose such an obligation, because the complaints which necessitated some change in larger areas did not apply to them. It might be provided that, in the event of a county council coming to the conclusion, after inquiry, that no scheme was necessary, a special report should be made to the Board of Education upon which that authority might be exempted. This might save a good deal of expense and irritation. The obligation would be general upon local authorities to make schemes, but in a few cases they might be released from the obligation. Speaking generally, there ought not to be much difficulty in the Government's framing a new clause which might come on for discussion not only on Report, but on the day in Committee for considering new clauses and schedules. Difficult as the task might be, the experiment should be made, for they were perishing for lack of interest. To the hon. Baronet the Member for Wigan he always listened with interest, for the older he grew the better speaker he became, and every word he spoke on this Bill supported the object everybody had at heart; but it was no answer to say that what could be delegated would, after all, be no great matter. If it was a sufficient matter to excite interest, they would have done something, and it might be, as time went on and our smaller areas became more animated with the spirit of education and the love of education, more and more power might be given to them, and the time might come when even they might be competent to appoint a teacher. They might begin with a day of small things which would grow to large ones. There was a provision made for the audit of the accounts, a technical matter which would have to be inserted in any proposal. He could not move to omit Clause 26, but he could see that it did not stand part of the Bill when it was put, on the understanding that he introduced as soon as he possibly could, before the Committee stage ended, a clause which should attempt what he had indicated.

Mr. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) regretted that the right hon. Gentleman in the interesting statement which he had made had not been able to give the Committee any hope of an elaborate discussion when the new clause came before it. It would come before the Committee with many others and this would be admittedly the most difficult and complicated of all. He would also ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he had obtained the assistance of the Local Government Board with regard to the drawing up of the clause. If he had not he would suggest that he should seek the assistance of that Department, so that the clause would be made really applicable to our local government system. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman was right in suggesting that there was any lack of zeal and energy upon the part of the local authorities in the matter of education. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Middleton and others on both sides of the House would admit that since the Act of 1902 was passed the local authorities had done excellent work in this direction, and had shown great zeal in doing their duty. But the education authorities had to cover very wide areas and, naturally, they had found it impossible to do the entire work to the general satisfaction of the locality. He admitted that if they could secure general control by a central authority and at the same time set up new areas of administration it would be a great advantage. But he was rather anxious when he heard of the exclusions that were to be made from the work to be done by these local authorities. He gathered from the observations of the right hon. Gentleman that there was very little to be done at present, but if these authorities justified their existence they would be given more to do in the future. If the right hon. Gentleman desired to have greater zeal in the future than there was at present he did not think he would attain that end by setting up these bodies and giving them no duties to perform. Devolution could only be attained in one way and that was that the Government should impose on the county councils the duty of framing schemes and give them, not only sufficient time to do so, but leave them a very wide discretion as to the form the scheme should take. When it came to the kind of body that was to be set up he was surprised at the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman, which seemed to suggest that women had been excluded from the administration of the Act of 1902. He believed they were—he did not like to use the word co-opted as it was considered offensive, but brought on to these bodies, and he thought under the new schemes women should be allowed to sit on these subordinate bodies. He understood that there were to be two kinds of subordinate bodies, one the body suggested in the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Middleton Division and the other the *ad hoc* body. If it was left to the county councils to settle the areas, if there was any power of that kind given to the county councils, he very much questioned whether it would be popular or whether it was necessary or whether it would have the result the hon. Member for Middleton desired to attain. What the hon. Member wanted was that there should be smaller areas than those now represented by the county councils; that there should be popularly elected representatives properly fitted for the work they had to do and having devolved upon them important duties in which they should be made to take an active and zealous part. He did not see the necessity for setting up new popularly elected bodies in any particular town. He thought the right policy was not to make new areas which were only combinations of other local government areas. He would rather see them able to group towns together and have those areas separately established. That was a way in which they could meet the difficulty described by his noble friend. Everybody in the House had great confidence in the discretion and common sense of the county councils as a whole, and on a question of this kind they and they alone could tell what would be the best areas and the best way of settling the question. He hoped when the clause was brought up it would be found to give the county councils a very wide discretion as to the formation of these areas; also that this policy would be imposed upon the county councils and that it would not be left to them to adopt a scheme on the initiation of an, subordinate authority. The Government knew what great inconvenience had been caused in the past by areas which had reached a population of 50,000 coming out of the area, becoming self-governing and leaving only the renmants to be governed by the county councils. Exactly the same result would take place if they allowed these changes to be made on the initiation of a small locality. He could not conceive anything worse than that there should be a patchwork system of that kind in the country. If they set up these bodies and created these new areas, real and not imaginary powers must be given to them, otherwise it would be difficult to get to serve the men and women whose services were worth having. He regretted that the discussion of this important subject was to be left to the fag end of the debates, and he hoped the Government would give their most careful consideration to the whole subject and invite the co-operation and assistance of the Local Government Board. He hoped the scheme would be drawn up in such a way as to give the local bodies the best chance of performing the duties to be entrusted to them successfully and well.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) thanked the Minister for Education for his sympathetic speech. To many workmen this was an important matter, especially in those areas where they formerly had school boards. Having lost these school boards under the 1902 Act it was impossible for them to take the same interest in educational affairs, and some step which would again give these men such an interest by enabling them to serve on these bodies would be accepted by them with extreme gratification. At present those who served on education committees felt themselves to be servants rather of the county council than of the district they represented, and that made a wonderful difference in their feelings. The proposal to give some financial powers to these bodies was advisable. The main thing to him was that it gave them power of management, which was the best feature of the scheme. The county council should take the initiative and not wait for local districts which had been laggard in regard to education to ask for these powers. Those who were responsible to-day for education should take the initiative in trying to rouse the feeling in smaller districts in favour of more direct responsibility for the education of the children. Some words should be inserted in the clause to enable women to serve on these bodies. If it was not convenient under this Bill to enable women to be elected to these bodies, at least the local authority should be given the power to appoint them to act on the committees, pending legislation which he hoped would deal with the whole subject of women serving on public bodies. It was an absurdity to talk about women being on the education authorities to-day. On the Lancashire County Council there were seventy members and only two of them were women. Although these two did do useful work it was impossible for them to do the work that, say, a dozen women might do who were elected by the will of the people. He hoped the Minister for Education would not be too much influenced by the pessimistic speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. Some of the difficulties that the right hon. Gentleman feared, he thought, would never be realised. He did hope that when the matter came before them again this debate would have paved the way for a unanimous decision in favour of the principle for which they were contending.

MR. CHEETHAM (Stalybridge) said the Cheshire County Council, which had carried out an enlightened education policy, had, for the purposes of delegation, taken the poor law union as its area; an administrative committee had been set up in each area, partly composed of the representatives of the county council, representing divisions within the area, partly composed of those who represented the local bodies in the area, and a small body composed of co-opted members, amongst whom women were always included. These administrative sub-committees reported periodically to the county council, but they were very largely autonomous. The power to appoint and dismiss teachers, which had been very carefully barred under the clause of his right hon. friend, was entrusted to these committees in the case of all provided schools, and, he believed, with excellent effect, but the question of teachers' salaries was carefully reserved to the county council, and he was bound to say that the Cheshire authorities were agreed that it would be unwise to place any separate financial responsibilities upon these sub-committees. Their opinion was that it would lead to great difficulty in the finances of the county, and inevitably lead to differential rating; at the same time some districts might starve their schools. Though the principle that had been so successfully carried out in Cheshire differed from the proposals of the Government, he hoped nothing would be done which was likely to embarrass or prejudice in any way the operations of the county council of Cheshire

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON feared that the Committee would not have any considerable opportunity of discussing the Government clause when it was brought up. Therefore, he hoped if this debate were prolonged it would be with a view to thrashing out the subject thoroughly, so that when they saw the new clause it would be framed in accordance with the opinion expressed in the debate. He had always been in favour of delegation. He was informed last year on good authority that one county council was spending £30,000 a year on administration alone. This was partly owing to the size of the area and the difficulty which individual members had in dealing with the work. And a further argument for delegation was the extent to which work was falling and would fall into the hands of the organising secretary. The hon. Member for the Richmond Division, speaking a few days earlier, had said that no teacher ought to stay too long in one school, and the remedy suggested was that the organising secretary should look round and see when a teacher ought to be transferred from one district to another. That seemed to him to be putting too much power in the hands of the officials in a matter which concerned managers and parents and the wishes of a locality. Much as they desired delegation they were always confronted with the difficulty of how the body should be constituted and what powers should be delegated to it. Would it be a body elected *ad hoc* ? Was it to be a nominated body and were the county councils to choose the members ? He doubted if that would meet the views of hon. Members on the Ministerial side who desired the localities to have a voice in the matter. Could they not devise a body by grouping existing local authorities and giving them power of co-option ? He fully realised the importance of adding a number of women to serve on those bodies, but when hon. Members complained of the dearth of women they forgot that it was entirely the fault of the county councils that they had not co-opted women in larger numbers on to education committees, and there really was no obstacle to placing women on boards of managers. But whilst this matter was still in abeyance—and it must be some time before any scheme of delegation could come into effect—was there not existing machinery which could be used ? It had been said that it was impossible for the members of the education committee in some counties to cover the whole area and attend to all their duties owing to the configuration of the country. He thought that was an argument for breaking up the area under Section 17 of the Act of 1902. It was said that the education committee was troubled with trifling matters which ought not to be brought before their notice. The local education committee under the schedule to the Act of 1902 could appoint as many sub-committees as it liked to deal with these small matters and thus relieve itself. That had been done with great success in several well-organised counties. He agreed that the law should be strengthened so that the Board of Education might allow local authorities to adapt their constitution to the circumstances and requirements of their respective areas. Then there was the question of the work to be delegated and he thought that it would not be at all impossible to allow these smaller bodies to frame a budget every year and submit it to the local authority and they could then accept the responsibility of keeping within their proper expenditure. They might assist the local authority in the choice of a teacher. It was most important that the people on the spot should be interested in the choice of teachers and have a voice in it. They might also advise the local authority as to the curriculum. If they got the local people personally interested in the schools they could do a good deal to assist the teacher to take an interest in the children and in their homes and help to raise the standard of the school.

MR. GEORGE WHITE said that after the sympathetic speech of the Minister for Education he desired to withdraw his Amendment.

*MR. LANE-FOX asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could give them some assurance that in the new clause or in some other way means would be given to secure the delegation of rating as well as other powers. It was a question of considerable interest in the West

Riding of Yorkshire. The inequalities alluded to by the hon. Member for Thirsk were nothing like so great as those in his part of the county. He would not enter into details, but he would mention the circumstances. In the rural parts of the West Riding they were paying a rate of 11d. in the £, whilst just across the river, in the East end in the North Riding, they were paying a rate of 6d. Practically and to all intents and purposes the same value in education was being received. He considered some means ought to be found by which rural districts which were not getting the same educational advantages as the urban districts paid for what they actually received. He did not say that in the urban districts full value might not be received; and a great deal of the increased expenditure was due to the great congestion to which reference had been made. The machinery of the West Riding had absolutely broken down under the centralisation effected. What he asked the right hon. Gentlemen to consider was whether it was not possible that this serious grievance might, to some extent, be relieved, because at the present time what made education so unpopular in his part of Yorkshire was the feeling that it was so expensive. They would never get the people in the rural parts of the West Riding interested in education unless they were assured that they got full value for the rate levied. He was perfectly convinced that that assurance would make it far more easy for the problem to be solved and would create interest in education in the rural districts.

Mr. WINFREY (Norfolk, S.W.) believed that if they gave the people a directly elected body they would meet what was most desired in all districts, and it might be done, so far as he could see, without the addition of a direct election. They might elect their delegated educational authority with the same ballot paper as was used in the election of the parish and rural district councils, and he thought this course was well worth the attention of the Minister for Education. In 1894 he was a returning officer for a considerable district at the first election of parish councils, and he had no difficulty in getting the electors to elect their parish council and rural district council on the same ballot paper. This course would, he urged, solve all difficulties about women, because they would only have to say that every man and woman in that area was eligible as a candidate.

*Mr. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said he agreed with the previous speaker that very much would depend on the nature of the election of the local bodies to which duties in regard to education were to be delegated. If they had direct power given to them by the people for whom they acted they would exercise their responsibility and authority in a much more natural and effective manner than if they were indirectly appointed. The Leader of the Opposition had expressed very serious doubt as to what powers should be given to the local bodies, but a gentleman of great experience had stated that almost all the powers which he doubted could be safely given to the local authorities were actually being used by the local authorities under the existing law. With regard to the bodies themselves he thought nothing would be more likely to secure the services of thoroughly good men than the giving of the same kind of powers, saving financial powers, as were actually exercised by the late school boards—he did not say all, but nearly all of them. They had over thirty years experience on which to go. Some of the school boards had been great failures, but it was well-known that others, even in country districts, had been great successes. They ought to level up and not level down in any new legislation which might be passed. He sympathised with his hon. friend the Member for Stalybridge in expressing the fear lest new legislation should be in the nature of a limitation rather than an extension of the powers which were now freely and rightly exercised. At a thoroughly representative meeting held the other day the National Education Association passed a resolution declaring that no system could be satisfactory where the schools were not effectually under the control of the local ratepayers and parents. He thought that expression of opinion was worthy of the attention of the Committee.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) joined in advocating a return to the *ad hoc* authority which would enable them again to have the presence of women at the meetings of the educational bodies. He sincerely hoped that when the Government brought forward their clause it would contain no statutory provision limiting the powers of the county councils to delegate. The smaller the area receiving the delegated power the better, because then the parents took more interest in the authority which governed the schools. Nothing could be sadder to an educationist than to hear what had been said by the Minister for Education about the lack of interest in education. That he was afraid showed the failure of educational effort during the last thirty-six years. The great point was to cultivate the interest of the community in education, and if they separated the education of the children from their parents and the small parishes in which they lived they would deprive the community of the best educational institution in the world, and then they would have the catastrophe of lack of interest in education. Once there was that lack of interest then good-bye to education of any kind worth having. He hoped power would be given to the local authorities to arrange the curriculum. Why was there such a terrible objection to giving them powers to make by-laws and to arrange the hours of school attendance? Some father might want to take his child away from book-learning to teach him gardening or agriculture—something that would be of real use during the remainder of its life. Certainly it was much better to make a good gardener or a good carpenter than a bad clerk.

*__Sir PHILIP MAGNUS__ (London University) said it was very satisfactory to see the amount of unanimity that prevailed in the Committee on the question of devolution. He joined with the other Members who had expressed their opinion in favour of devolving certain powers on the smaller bodies representing smaller areas. It had been generally recognised in educational matters that he administration of elementary education might be entrusted to small areas, while it was advisable that the administration of secondary and higher education should be confined to much larger areas, and for that reason he welcomed the announcement made by the President of the Board of Education that Clause 25 of the Bill had been withdrawn. While they were all unanimous with regard to the matter of devolution, he thought they were all equally agreed as to the difficulties the Minister for Education had to face in framing a scheme which would give effect to the views expressed by different Members of the House. The hon. Member for the Sleaford Division was in favour of a certain kind of education only, and did not approve of book learning. In many respects he sympathised with him, and for that reason he would be very glad indeed that the smaller bodies should have the opportunity of making suggestions with regard to the curriculum that was to be pursued in many of the elementary schools. At the same time he appreciated very fully the difficulties which had been referred to with regard to the question of differential rating. He feared very much that if differential rating were introduced in the rural districts it would not be the richer but the poorer areas that would thereby suffer. Certainly that would be the case in Surrey where, as a member of the education committee of the county council he had some experience. There the effect of any differentiation of the rate would be that parishes with a large rateable value and a comparatively small working population would suffer at the expense of other parishes. It had been suggested on the other side that it would be advisable, if it could be done, to introduce the old school board arrangement. The suggestion was made largely because the interest in education had not been maintained under the 1902 Act. His own experience was exactly in the opposite direction. He certainly believed that by entrusting the arrangements of education to the municipal bodies and county councils they had increased to a very large extent the interest of the people in education, and he should not be at all disposed to see any return to the school board system. It had been suggested by, he thought, the Minister for Education that it might be advisable that the bodies to whom the devolved powers were to be entrusted should be elected *ad hoc.* He deprecated any increase in the number of *ad hoc* elections, but he should not be altogether opposed to certain members of those bodies being popularly elected. He sincerely trusted that the Minister for Education in considering what should be the constitution of the new bodies would take into account the desirableness of introducing into the constitution some system of co-option. The Minister for Education very much objected to the word co-optative. He himself should be very glad to substitute the word "added," but it was most important, even if these bodies consisted largely of persons popularly elected, that there should at the same time be persons added to the bodies who would not be willing to undergo the trouble of popular election, but who, nevertheless, were deeply interested in educational matters and would be very glad to serve on such bodies. He would like to see a number of women appointed on these bodies. He fully agreed with every word which had fallen from the Minister for Education and other Members as to the very great importance of interesting people in their own local schools. For his part he did not attach so much importance to the character of the duties which were likely to be assigned to these bodies. The most important thing, in his opinion, was to interest the people in their own schools and to allow the members of the delegations to make suggestions in regard to the curriculum, and to add to those bodies persons who could, even in an advisory capacity, render valuable service. On all these grounds he was strongly in favour of the principle of devolution, and he hoped that it would not be beyond the powers of the Minister for Education to bring up a clause which would meet these views.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not want to deal again with this important subject, and he only rose to warn the Committee that though there had been a great amount of unanimity of opinion as to the desirability of dealing with this subject, nevertheless it was not the kind of unanimity which indicated the rapid passage of any measure designed to carry out the general wish. True, they were all in favour of some measure of devolution; but every Gentleman had his own fad, as the debate had shown, and underlying the general agreement there was a very wide divergence of opinion representing not Party, but the natural division of opinion among men who approached from different points of view a complicated and difficult problem. He did not think that this debate should come to an end now. And he was strengthened in that opinion by the fact that when the new clause came to be considered other clauses which must demand a certain amount of consideration would have to be dealt with on the same day. He submitted that it was impossible to deal satisfactorily with this problem under the present severe limitations of time, and that it must be dealt with in a separate Bill. He was sorry to appear to be a gloomy critic, but he did not see how they could mix this question up with the other controversial matters which must occupy so much of their time. They would have less than a week to consider it. He doubted whether the right hon. Gentleman would be able to put his proposal on the Paper before the end of the week or Monday; and he therefore suggested, in a friendly spirit, whether it would not be desirable to embody the proposal in a separate Bill, so that full opportunity should be given to everybody concerned, whether the local authorities or Members of the House, to consider the problem in all its aspects. He was sure that what they were now trying to do they would not be able to do in the brief time that was available.

Mr. BIRRELL said that, while recognising the friendly spirit of the right hon. Gentleman, he did not really think that the problem presented very great difficulty, as the right hon. Gentleman suggested. He did not feel that there was anything in the proposed new clause which need alarm hon. Gentlemen or lead them to suppose that if it became law it would be dangerous or interfere with the future development of devolution. Admitting that the drafting of the clause would be a somewhat difficult task and that it would not confer upon the smaller areas all the powers which they might some day, he hoped a not distant day, have entrusted to them, it would still be a step in the right direction. He would give the matter most careful consideration, and he was not without hope that a clause might be introduced, and discussed both in Committee and on Report, which might be regarded as a minimum clause, and as such receive general support.

*COLONEL WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.) said that in his own county they had tried hard to delegate matters to the school managers, but had found that if purchasing powers were included it would involve a separate audit for each school, and it would result in putting an additional burden on the county of something like £500 a year. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to adopt the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition in regard to bringing in a new Bill. As to the matter of rating, anybody who knew the country districts knew that chaos reigned. For the last three or four years and since the Report of the Rating Commission they had been hoping for reform. This new provision as to delegation and devolution would, however, make things worse. If once a wrong beginning was made, of course they went in a wrong direction, and it was better to make a right beginning however tentative. He did not think that the clause contained all the provisions which were necessary to ensure justice. Therefore he thought they had better put off the consideration of the matter for a time. The debate however was a most encouraging sign, as it showed both interest and knowledge of the subject. It could not have taken place five years ago, but it showed that although knowledge on this subject had crystallised, it had not done so in any particular form, and at the present moment the House was not ready to bring about devolution. They could wait for six months for a better considered scheme; therefore he thought the question had better be deferred and that they should not cumber their discussions with it.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said he had been asked by the Lancashire County Council to lay their views before the Committee. He had listened to this debate with great care, and the more he had listened to it the more he was convinced that hon. Members, although they were agreed upon an ideal, were most hopelessly divided as to the method by which that ideal could be attained. The clause of the hon. Member for Middleton would hardly survive the criticism of the hon. Member for North Camberwell. The President of the Board of Education had said that he was most anxious that they should agree about this subject and that the Government proposed to bring in a new clause. But he had given no indication whatever as to what his new clause was going to contain. Would it give the local bodies powers in regard to the salary and dismissal of teachers? He was confident that it would not give the delegated body any power to make by-laws as to attendance, which was really the important point, or to deal with the curriculum. Capital charges and rent were also to be excluded, and he wanted to know what powers were to be given. A very interesting speech had been made by the hon. Member for Stalybridge, in the course of which he said—"For goodness sake, whatever you do in your new clause, do not interfere with our system in Cheshire, which is working admirably." He did not know what was done under that scheme, but he knew that the experience of the Lancashire County Council led them to condemn the idea of devolution very strongly indeed from various points of view. He did not say that he agreed with them in everything they said, but he wished to lay before the Committee the views of the Lancashire Education Committee, who represented the Lancashire education authority. They had issued a criticism of the clause and they said it would increase the difficulties of administration. That was a very serious thing to say. They pointed out that it would introduce a system of dual control, complicate the keeping of accounts, increase the assessments of particular parishes, and inevitably increase expenditure in consequence of the division of responsibility. Finally they said that in the interests of the county the clause should be opposed. He did not go so far as that himself, but he wished to state their view.

*MR. ADKINS said the Report of the full Educational Committee of the County Council showed that they only approved of the Report of the sub-committee as regarded Clause 26 with a proviso that they would be prepared to delegate some of their powers including school management to smaller local authorities.

LORD BALCARRES said he was aware of that, but objection was taken to the divided responsibility and the increased expenditure which would arise under Clause 26. These were subjects which would require the most careful consideration of the Government. The Amendments of the Government would be placed upon the Paper at the latest possible moment, and he could not believe from the speech made by the Minister for Education that he had any idea of what his new clause was going to contain. He did not suppose that they should see it for two or three days, and what he wanted to know was whether if the House had no time to consider it the right hon. Gentleman would withdraw it and deal with the matter in a separate Bill at some later period. For his part he would prefer to see the consideration of the clause postponed to a more fitting period, as the subject was fraught with great complexity.

VISCOUNT MORPETH said that those hon. Members who were interested in the administration of education were entitled to have sufficient time to discuss a matter of this kind in all its bearings, and it was quite obvious that when this new clause was brought forward there would not be time for discussing the question fully. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not assume that either the House or the county councils were unanimous upon the question. The County Council of Lancashire felt very strongly against Clause 26 as it stood at present. There was a great objection to the multiplication of machinery, and as the Bill now stood machinery was piled upon machinery. There was not sufficient work to be divided amongst these different authorities or bodies. In Lancashire they already had under the present Act a system of devolution and district committees set up for this purpose, and the universal complaint there was that there was not sufficient work for these committees to do. Under this Bill similar committees were to be set up in all the other counties of England. It was for that reason that the matter was of such vital importance to those who had to deal with the question in the counties. Those who had to deal with it said that they should be allowed sufficient time to consider these questions and that they should not be squeezed into ten minutes at the end of the day.

Amendment negatived.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said he had an Amendment to leave out the words in the second line of the clause "or of any parish," in order to insert "having a population of not less than thirty thousand." He understood the right hon. Gentleman had given an undertaking to extend these powers to parish councils. To that he himself was quite opposed, and it was for that reason he moved this Amendment in order to give the Committee an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it. While he was thoroughly in sympathy with the idea of delegation there was no reason why it should go too far in that direction; there was no virtue in the word "delegation," and the virtue of the system remained only so long as the principle was properly applied. He did not gather from his right hon. friend that he proposed to exempt a single parish from the provisions of this new clause. Of course if the right hon. Member did propose to exempt the smaller parishes, and would give an assurance to that effect, he would withdraw the Amendment. The effect of the Amendment would be to limit the power for application for delegated powers to authorities in districts with a population of 30,000 and over.

MR. BIRRELL said he did not propose to grant an extension of this clause so as to give the power of initiation to any particular parish. That was one objection to the clause, and in the new clause he should adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member for Middleton and leave it entirely for the local authority to say what the delegation area should be. It might very well be that the local authority might consider some of these parish councils were proper authorities to whom to delegate these powers, but that he could not say. As the clause was not going to stand part of the Bill it seemed to him hardly necessary to move the Amendment.

Mr. YOXALL said that as he understood from the right hon. Gentleman that in the clause proposed there was no compulsion on the county councils to extend these powers to single parishes, he would not move the Amendment.

Lord BALCARRES said he thought this matter should be discussed, and he would therefore move the Amendment *pro forma.*

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 17, to leave out the words 'or of any parish.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Mr. BIRRELL suggested it was hardly necessary to proceed with the discussion of an Amendment of a clause which was not going to remain part of the Bill. The subject had already been fully discussed and he thought it was undesirable to continue this verbal criticism.

Mr. WALTER LONG said he quite understood the desire not to debate questions that might arise again hereafter, but as he had pointed out with regard to a previous Amendment it was not only possible, but it was quite conceivable, that they might not have an opportunity of discussing this new clause when it came before the Committee. It was not the right hon. Gentleman's fault, but he knew that the operation of the closure would prevent any but the briefest discussion. He thought there ought to be an assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that in drafting his clause, steps would be taken to make it clear that there would only be delegation where there was a population of a certain size.

Mr. BIRRELL did not think county councils were at all likely to select imperfectly equipped, unsuitable parishes for their experiments in delegation, and therefore it did not seem necessary to have this safeguard, but he would give the matter careful consideration.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause disagreed to.

Clause 27:—

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield) said the existing local authorities had already compulsory powers to purchase land, but none to purchase it by agreement; his object was to insert words to make it possible to purchase land either compulsorily or by agreement: he begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 38, to leave out the word 'compulsory.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. BIRRELL said that this was a technical clause which he supposed the Committee would like to have explained. The first subsection gave the educational authorities the same power to acquire land compulsorily for the purpose of higher education as they had now for the purpose of elementary education. The county council already possessed this power under a section of the Local Government Act of 1888. The result of this section was to put county boroughs on terms of equality with county councils in this respect. There seemed to be some doubt whether they had the power to acquire land by agreement for the purpose of secondary education. He did not think there was any doubt, but as doubt was entertained, they might as well get rid of it, and he agreed that the words in the subsection should read "for the purchase of land either compulsorily or by agreement."

Question put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 16, line 38, to insert the words 'either compulsorily or by agreement.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted"

MR. WALTER LONG pointed out that the law affecting the purchase of land by compulsion was contained in a great many statutes and was a somewhat complicated question. He should like some assurance as to the exact effect of what was now proposed.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 22, to leave out the words 'Board of Education' and to insert the words 'local education authority.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. BIRRELL said he would look into the matter.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 27, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

MR. STUART asked the President of the Board of Education whether he would be prepared before the Report stage of the Bill to consider the extension of the principle of the clause. The clause permitted for the first time an education authority which had acquired land for one educational purpose to apply it to another educational purpose. Would the right hon. Gentleman be willing to allow land purchased by a local authority, which was also the educational authority, for other local purposes to be utilised for educational purposes and *vice versa*? It was quite obvious that there should be some safeguard. For instance, if land intended for a public garden was to be used for a school, there might be some objection, and a local inquiry might be necessary to safeguard the interests of those concerned.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said he regarded the proposal which had been made with some apprehension, and he hoped the Government would not accept the suggestion of the hon. Member. The accounts of local authorities were already exceedingly complicated, and confusion of the most serious character might easily arise if this power were given. The hon. Member for Sunderland suggested that land purchased for a public garden and sanctioned by the Local Government Board should be applied to educational purposes, when really the loan for that purpose ought to be sanctioned by the Board of Education under this clause. Under those circumstances it would be impossible for the Local Government Board to know whether the loan had been properly applied, and confusion of the most serious character might arise which would complicate the accounts of the local committees still more than they were at present. He desired to ask the right hon. Gentleman what was meant by the words in subsection (3)—

"The Board of Education shall order such equitable adjustment thereof to be made as they think right under the circumstances."

The only meaning that occurred to him was that where land had been bought for an elementary school and was used for a secondary school, the secondary school would benefit a larger area, and therefore there must be a readjustment. He thought that would be a very complicated and difficult measure to carry out, and might give rise to considerable local feeling. He did not see in the clause any machinery for a local inquiry.

MR. BIRRELL said the meaning of the words referred to was exactly what the noble Lord stated. A certain portion of the expense of building an elementary school was thrown on the parish on the ground that it served the purposes of that parish only; but if a secondary school was substituted a larger area was served, and in that case a readjustment would be necessary to secure justice. The noble Lord said he did not see the machinery. The Board of Education would, of course, satisfy itself by local inquiry or otherwise with regard to the facts. As to the point raised by the hon. Member for

Sunderland, that was really a local government question. He did not know that he could object to the appropriation to educational purposes of land acquired for some other purpose. He would consider that, but he could not see his way to take the converse case into consideration. He did not see that any hardship would be done by land acquired for one purpose being devoted to an educational purpose, although he should object to land acquired for educational purposes being devoted to any other purpose.

MR. WALTER LONG said he thought the Minister for Education would find that it was not merely a question of land acquired for local government purposes being used for educational purposes. These powers were more likely to be used for speculative purposes. He thought Parliament ought to discourage, in the interests of the ratepayers, the speculative purchase of land, upon which local authorities were so often urged to enter. As to the criticism which had been made by his noble friend, he thought the President of the Board of Education would be well advised to transfer jurisdiction in this matter from the Board of Education to the Local Government Board, which was already accustomed to discharge similar tasks.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE said it would be a dangerous thing to enable local authorities to acquire land which might be used for speculative purposes, and which would entail a great increase in the rates; but local authorities often possessed land which, acquired for a special purpose, was no longer of use for that purpose, and to debar it from using it because there was no machinery to enable it to do so, seemed to him to be absurd. It might be subject to any special permission of the Local Government Board, but to continue to refuse to sanction the use of it was only what one might expect from an extreme Tory. We had recently had a visit from the German municipalities, and one of the most remarkable circumstances which they had brought to our knowledge was that in a large number of towns in Germany they were almost free from rates, because they had had the prudence to acquire, through the medium of their municipalities, large areas of land round their towns which they had been able to turn to the advantage of the communities. Whenever he heard alarm expressed that municipalities were not to be entrusted with powers to make these acquisitions, he could only say it was very inconsistent with entrusting them with the powers which this House was constantly conferring upon them.

LORD R. CECIL said his own experience of the accounts of local authorities did not lead him to take so roseate a view. He would like to know if the Board of Trade had any power to direct an inquiry. The powers of the Local Government Board in this matter were much more general.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 28:—

MR. ARMITAGE (Leeds, Central) moved an Amendment extending the period for the repayment of loans to eighty years. He thought we might be sure the school buildings would last for that length of time, and we had almost reached, if not quite reached, the period of their final development, so that there was not much risk that they would soon be out of date. He was aware that objections were entertained to granting long periods of repayment to local authorities, but he thought there was a great deal to be said in favour of this Amendment in reference to the school buildings. As a rule the sites for these schools were chosen in the midst of large centres of population, and instead of decreasing would be almost sure to increase in value. If hon. Members could see the new schools which were being put up in a city like Leeds, they would know the kind of development that was going on. It had been said that in some cases losses had been made by local authorities, but that had occurred mostly in cases where the money had been spent upon trading concerns which had not reached their final stage of development, such as the machinery for gasworks and electric lighting works. In such speculations as those a shorter period of repayment was absolutely necessary. In a case like this, where there was no machinery, he felt sure that there could be no risk in giving to the local authorities powers to repay over the period of eighty years. The nearer they got to theoretical perfection in these buildings the longer should be the term over which repayment of loans could be legitimately spread. The cost of the repayment of the loans was very heavy on the local authorities. The education rates in this country, raised by the local authorities, had been growing in a much larger ratio than the contributions from the Imperial Exchequer. The figures for the last three years showed that while the contributions from the Imperial Exchequer had averaged less than an increase of 7 per cent., the increase in the money that had had to be raised by the local authorities was upwards of 21 per cent. each year. The rates were a great burden on large and growing communities, and a great service would be done to them if under proper regulations the period for the repayment of loans could be somewhat extended. Although the term for cities was sixty years it was almost impossible to get a loan for that period. In the city of Leeds there was only one site of a school in connection with which the repayment was sixty years. That was a site for a school for cripple children, and the amount was only £1,408. The loans for all the other sites were repayable within fifty years. If the repayment of loans for school sites could be spread over eighty years, as in the case of cottages for the working classes, there would be a great saving on the repayments. That saving would greatly benefit the education committees in the work they were undertaking. If it was right to allow repayment over eighty years in the case of cottages for the housing of the working classes, surely it might be claimed that loans on the schools attended by their children might be repaid over a similar period.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 31, to leave out the word 'sixty' and insert the word 'eighty.'"—(*Mr. Armitage.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. Armitage.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.) said the clause itself extended the period for repayment of loans from thirty to sixty years, which was a very substantial extension. His hon. friend now wished further to extend the time for repayment from sixty to eighty years. In the clause the Government had given the extreme period. He really thought that none of the arguments submitted in support of the Amendment ought to convince the Committee that the period should be extended further. His hon. friend might think it was a counsel of perfection to say that a locality would do better if it did not borrow at all. There would be no relief given to the ratepayers by long borrowing. In the long run the localities would have to pay nearly twice as much. The value of sites in towns did not always increase. Sites which were valuable and costly might in twenty years lose a great deal of their value. There was no security whatever that schools put up now would in eighty years time be at all suitable for the requirements of that day.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he had some experience of local loans and he was sure it was wisest for Parliament to discourage these loans for long periods. They were financially bad. No one could tell what would be the requirements of education in thirty years time. There had been great and revolutionary changes in the past, and he believed there would be changes of no less importance in the near future. As trustees for the next generation they would act unwisely if they put on them a burden of which we ourselves were unwilling to bear a share.

MR. J. F. MASON (Windsor), in opposing the Amendment, said the question of the period of repayment of loans of this kind was equivalent to the question of depreciation of plant in industrial concerns. The period of sixty years was equivalent to something under 1¾ per cent. of depreciation. The depreciation of plant was usually, and ought always to be, fixed by the consideration of how long the plant would actually take to wear out or how long it would be before it was obsolete. He thought school buildings came under the second heading. It was quite evident that the time must come when the buildings which were put up to-day would be as unfit for the purposes for which they were built as other buildings in the past were unfit for the purposes of to-day. Of the schools built between 1870 and 1875 there were exceedingly few which now remained in their original condition. If they existed at all, large sums had been spent in altering them and bringing them up to the requirements of the period. It was not fair to draw an analogy between schools and dwelling houses with relation to the question of the repayment of loans. Dwelling houses were not subject, as schools were, to the demands of fashion, the advancing demands of science, and the variation of opinions of successive inspectors. It was absolutely unreasonable to suppose that the schools which were put up to-day would suffice for the requirements of more than one generation. If that was so, it would be most unfair and unwise to burden two generations with their cost. It would make it exceedingly difficult for our grandchildren to face the necessary requirements of their own age. Besides it was demoralising to our own age to encourage extravagance at the expense of future ratepayers.

Mr. ARMITAGE asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE moved an Amendment that repayment of loans for building schools should be under the Education Act, 1902. He explained that he moved the Amendment in order to give the Minister for Education an opportunity of stating what the intention was with regard to loans raised under the old system since the passing of the Act of 1902. When the Act of 1870 was passed the universal term allowed by the Education Department for the repayment of loans was fifty years, and when in 1893 their powers of regulating loans were transferred to the Local Government Board that period was cut down to thirty years. Now the Education Department very properly proposed to extend the period to sixty years; but if that was right, it was also right that those local education authorities who had been compelled to conform to the Act of 1902 and borrow at the limit of thirty years should have the same facilities extended to them which would be enjoyed by other bodies. It was with that object that he proposed to make the Act retrospective.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 38, at the end, to add the words, 'and the Local Government Board may extend, to a period not exceeding sixty years from the date of the original loan, the period within which any loan raised by a local education authority for the purposes of the Education Acts after the passing of the Education Act, 1902, shall be repaid.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. LOUGH said that the effect of the Amendment would be to make the clause retrospective, and this would be impracticable. The lender who had agreed to a loan on the understanding that it would be repaid at the end of thirty years could not be made to extend the period without his consent. The clause dealt as favourably as possible with the circumstances of the case. It would cover any existing loan that could be reborrowed with the consent of both parties. He hoped, therefore, his hon. friend would be satisfied with having raised the question. The Amendment was one which the Government could not possibly accept.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON said that it was a hardship on certain necessitous areas that the period for the repayment of the loan should have been curtailed by the Act of 1902. There was no reason why the period should not be extended with the consent of a willing lender and a willing borrower; and he hoped the matter would receive the serious consideration of the Government.

Mr. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said he thought that a few words might be put into the clause by which an extension of the period of repayment of the loan might be granted when the lender and the borrower both desired it. He could not see why a penalty should be imposed on the most energetic authorities who had borrowed between 1902 and 1905, while the authorities which had lagged behind were to get the advantage of a repayment extending over sixty years.

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE said he wanted to make the Act retrospective only to 1902. He believed it would be impossible for the parties to come to an arrangement, because the Local Government Board had not the power to consent to such an arrangement.

Mr. LOUGH said that the Bill used the word "reborrowings." The hon. Member did not wish the existing annuity on an existing loan to be paid over a longer period of years. He wanted a smaller annuity to be made for a larger number of years. When that was agreed to between the parties, it constituted a fresh loan. If the hon. Member read the clause carefully he would see that it secured his object in the best way.

***Colonel WILLIAMS** said he thought that those authorities who had borrowed for a period of thirty years were in a far better position than those who had borrowed for a period of sixty years. If local bodies incurred two loans at different dates it would be a most extravagant mode of municipal finance. He hoped that nothing would be done to accentuate the already difficult position in regard to rating.

Sir HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said he was in favour of the view taken by the Secretary of the Board of Education with regard to reborrowings. He thought the view which the hon. Gentleman had expressed was a very sound one.

Sir JAMES WOODHOUSE said he was willing to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. J. W. Wilson.

Mr. J. F. MASON (Windsor) moved to reduce the period from sixty to thirty-five years. He agreed with the argument of the Lancashire Education Committee that the length and period, although convenient to the spending authority, was bad for future ratepayers, and that the accumulations of municipal debts were largely due to the facilities for borrowing which had been afforded. He was encouraged to think that the Government were disposed to adopt this Amendment through the statement of the Secretary to the Board of Education to the effect that we had no proof that a building would be useful for school purposes after eighty years had elapsed. He thought this or a similar Amendment ought to be accepted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 31, to leave out the word 'sixty' and insert the words 'thirty-five.'"—(*Mr. J. F. Mason.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'sixty' stand part of the clause."

Mr. LOUGH, with complete sympathy with the economic reasoning for the Amendment, justified the period of sixty years on the ground that it was now allowed to local authorities. He pointed out that it did not follow that money would be borrowed for sixty years; that was simply the limit of the period.

***Mr. BURDETT-COUTTS** (Westminster) considered that the first speech of the Secretary to the Board of Education was the strongest argument for the Amendment, because he said that the local authority should raise such credit as it could upon the cash of the year. That was stated by the hon. Gentleman to be an ideal position, and the question now was whether the Government were not going to the other extreme by putting in a period of sixty years instead of the more legitimate and wise period of thirty-five years. His hon. friend the Member for Windsor had stated that schools built since 1870 had had to be almost re-built. That was quite true; but more remained. In London, since 1903, the new education authority had insisted on further large and costly changes. There was no such finality in school building and equipment as would justify involving the ratepayers for sixty years in the present expenditure. Not only would new requirements constantly arise, but new inventions were always appearing which had to be utilised. It was common knowledge that new and cheaper methods of building, just as permanent as now, were being adopted. In thirty-five years it might be possible to build a better school for half the present cost. But the ratepayers would then find themselves loaded for another twenty-five years with the cost of the old ones, under the present clause. There was another point which he submitted it was legitimate to make, and of great importance. The history of such loans was one of constantly falling interest. Who could say that in another thirty-five years money would not be obtainable for such purposes at a lower rate of interest than now? But for twenty-five years after that, if this Amendment was rejected, the ratepayers would have to pay the existing rate. The only argument advanced in favour of sixty years was that other bodies now had power to borrow for that period, but to his mind, because a bad example had been set, that was no argument in favour of its being followed. He thought that the whole position of ratepayers at the present time was one which should make them very careful about increasing their present heavy burdens. Prudence, economy, and consideration for ratepayers all demanded that local authorities should not be tempted by the long period to borrow to an extravagant extent.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON was doubtful whether the system of supervision over proposed new schools as exercised by the Board of Education and the Local Government Board provided adequate security that the money was properly expended or that the ratepayers got the worth of their money. He was not quite sure that the dual control which was proposed would produce the admirable result which had been suggested. The Board of Education said that the plans of the school would meet their requirements and the Local Government Board said that the financial condition of the local authority was such that they were able to bear the burden, and between the two the ratepayers had no option. The Committee must bear in mind that the ratepayers had what was called a wasting security. In the ordinary course of things these buildings decayed and needed repair and might in time cease to be required. New board schools were often exceedingly costly in their construction, and conditions might change and a building cease to serve its purpose while the ratepayers were still groaning under the burden of the charge for its erection. Having regard to all these circumstances, the great cost of the building, the doubtful nature of the supervision exercised over the cost between two Government Departments, each efficient, who did not bring concentrated opinion to bear upon the precise worth of the return for the money which the local authority were beginning to expend on a school; having regard to the fact that conditions might change in twenty-five years, while the ratepayers might go on paying for sixty years; having regard to the fact that the rate of interest might fall and that the ratepayers as time went on might be paying a rate of interest in excess of the rate of the day—having regard to all these circumstances he confessed that fifty years which was the period allowed for repayment of school loans before the Act of 1902 was passed seemed to him a full if not excessive period for which a loan should run. The Board of Education should consider this matter very carefully before they encouraged the local authorities in their very natural desire to come up to the ideal of efficiency set up by the educational views or fancies of the day and so to spend more money than they ought. He thought greater economy might be exercised without in any way affecting the comfort or efficiency of the schools. The Board of Education ought to think seriously before they gave this additional stimulant to the natural tendency of our municipal bodies to be magnificent in their dealings with money at the expense of posterity.

LORD BALCARRES desired to say one word of protest against the extension of the period to sixty years. The reasons given for it were quite inadequate. They did not know who asked for the change or whether it was really required. His view was that the Government well knew that the £1,000,000 provided in Clause 12 of the Bill would be wholly insufficient to meet the great burdens placed on the local authority by this measure. If they adopted this measure of bad finance what was the burden on the education authority? The Lancashire Education Committee, which took no objection to this clause on educational grounds, took the very greatest objection to it on the ground that it was economically unsound. The hon. Member who opened the debate had suggested eighty years instead of sixty. That was manifestly impossible, but the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education a few minutes previously had drawn attention to the fact that the words of the Act were not "sixty years," but "not exceeding sixty years," and he appealed to his right hon. friend beside him as a guarantee against extravagance. He hoped that there were other Members of the Treasury Bench besides the President of the Local Government Board who would protest against extravagance. Did school buildings last for sixty years? Was there one building put up sixty years ago which could be said to be up to modern requirements? He denied it most emphatically, and the best illustration he could give was London. There were schools built in London in 1870-1871, but not one of those buildings existed now in its primitive condition. In view of that state of things how was it reasonable to urge that the period of extension for the repayment of loans for these buildings should be extended from thirty-five years to sixty? He submitted that no adequate reason could be urged for making this long extension. From an economic point of view these proposals were thoroughly bad. No one had been stronger against this policy of loans than the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had abandoned in one Department the practice of having loans altogether, yet through another public Department in which loans were far less necessary than loans for naval and military works, the Government came down and extended the system in a manner which was most grave and dangerous.

Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) hoped the Government would adhere to their clause. Municipal authorities had for twenty years been asking for an extension of the time for such repayment. It was said it would lead to municipal extravagance. He considered that municipal extravagance would compare very favourably with national extravagance. He denied that the extension of time would lead to extravagance. There was such a thing as starvation in regard to the matter, and by the extension borough councils and county councils would be able to carry out the work of education with more efficiency and economy, whereas now they were crippled by the short period allowed. As one who had taken part in the agitation he was pleased with the change proposed, and hoped the Government would adhere to the sixty instead of the thirty years.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 309; Noes, 66. (Division List No. 213.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins. W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, JosephA.(Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonport
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff.)
Black, ArthurW.(Bedfordshire)
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton. T.D.(Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.

Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick

Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs.)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.

Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thos. (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)

Schwann, SirC.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H.(SomersetE
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir ThomasPalmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W.(Hull,W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse,Lord(Norfolk,Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Hudd'rsfi'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham(Lewisham)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool,Walton
Starkey, John R.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon, Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. James Mason.

Motion made, and Question "That Clause 28 stand part of the Bill," put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 309; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 214.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, JosephA. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W.(Bedfordshire
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, T.D.(Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)

Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E. Grinstd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)

Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel

Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tynesdie)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Sears, J. E.

Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, SirEdward (Salisbury
Thomas, DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, JohnCathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. Glamorgan
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon.C.H.W.(Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh,N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse,Lord(Norfolk, Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlexF.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beach, Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt.Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnH.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Whitehead, Rowland
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Evelyn Cecil and Mr. Cave.

Clause 29:—

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) moved an Amendment providing that before any increase was made in the existing rate for the purposes of secondary education the question should be referred to the ratepayers. His object was to prevent county councils committing themselves to expenditure for secondary education without first consulting the ratepayers, whose money they were going to spend. It was a perfectly well accepted principle in legislation, and it was obviously one which ought to be applied by a Party which professed its belief in democracy. If they did not accept this Amendment it would show that they were unwilling to trust the people, and that their boasted belief in democracy had no real meaning. Personally he would in some ways prefer that the county council should not spend more money on secondary education, because he did not believe that secondary education was one of those things that ought to be entrusted either to county councils or to municipal authorities; they had quite enough to do with elementary education. But he quite realised that in some areas there was an insufficiency of appliances for secondary education, and in such cases it was desirable that where the people wanted it further provision should be made. Therefore he put down this Amendment so as to give the ratepayers the opportunity of deciding the matter. They knew perfectly well that if they withdrew the limit on the amount which might be raised an increase of expenditure would be always indulged in, for that was the way with the municipal authorities. One great reason for objecting to the clause as it stood was the injustice it would inflict upon those people who had already established private schools and in many cases were giving really excellent education which was paid for by the people who wanted it. They were now proposing to tax these people in order to subsidise their competitors. The county council first taxed the private school and then put beside it another school to compete with it, charging lower fees in order to increase the competition. He admitted there were private schools which were not efficient, and that there were special cases in which there should be competition, but his Amendment provided for that. He desired on more general grounds to protest against this proposal to place the whole education of the country in the hands of county councils and municipal bodies. He considered that a most disastrous step was taken in 1902 when the late Government prepared the way for the destruction of voluntary schools. He believed more was done to destroy the voluntary schools of this country by the late Administration than by any other Government. They placed those schools on the rates and by that means necessarily destroyed their voluntary character. He contended that there was no general deficiency of schools for secondary education. On the contrary, we had on the whole a better system of secondary education than any country in the world. During the two years he spent in India he enjoyed the friendship of a distinguished Indian gentleman, Sir Syed Ahmad, who did great service to this country during the Mutiny. After the Mutiny, Syed Ahmad asked himself, "How is it that England has conquered my country instead of India conquering England ?" and he decided that he would come to England in order to solve the problem. He came to England and in the course of his travels here he asked a great many questions which led him to the conclusion that the secret of the success of England throughout the world was her public school system. He returned to India, and founded a school and college there on the model of the English public schools and colleges. With all this State education we were risking our public school system which had been built up by private benevolence and enterprise. Much of the advice now coming from the Education Department was very good, but it was still manned by men who had obtained their education under the voluntary system in our great public schools and Universities, which happily were not under the control of the State. But when every man in that Department had begun his career in a board school our whole educational system would be enclosed in a circle and get no ideas from outside. That was the condition to which we must inevitably tend if we destroyed voluntary and private education. He asked the Committee to accept the Amendment, which would give the ratepayers a chance of considering the matter themselves instead of accepting the dictation of their local officials, for that was what really happened in practice. In the central as well as local government officialism was becoming the curse of the country. We talked of public control, but in practice it meant control by some second-class clerk who sat in a back office with a roll of red tape and ruled the kingdom. The chief glory of this country in the past had been its devotion to liberty. We should lose that honour and our rank among the nations of the world if we became the slaves of permanent officials.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 17, line 42, at the end, to add the words 'but before any increase is made in the existing rate, or any loan is raised for the purposes of education, other than elementary, in any county, county borough, borough or district, it shall be ascertained by a poll of the ratepayers within the said county, county borough, borough, or district, that a majority of such ratepayers are in favour of the increase."—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. BIRRELL said he had listened to the hon. Member as to a voice from the grave. He reminded his hon. friend that they were discussing the 2d. limit, and they could not say the honour and glory of this country were involved in that question. The county boroughs were not restricted in this way. The object of the clause was to remove the restriction from county councils. When the hon. Gentleman told them that secondary education in this country was in the most perfect condition, and better than that of any other country in the world, he heard him with amazement. He was surprised to hear the hon. Gentleman speak of the public schools of this country as if they were entirely the result of voluntary enterprise. He thought they were sheltered by ancient traditions and ancient endowments. The last thing any public school man would admit was that he was at a private school. What was desired was that we should have a complete system of education in this country beginning in the elementary schools at the age of five and terminating at twelve, thirteen or fourteen, and then for those boys and girls who had faculty for learning proceeding through the secondary schools to the Universities. There was nothing we could be more proud of in regard to our system of education than the fact that the highest honours of our ancient Universities had been won by boys from the elementary schools. It showed that our system of elementary education, supported by a proper system of secondary education, placed the highest rewards of learning at the disposal of the children of all classes of the country. In regard to the 2d. limit, he did not see why the county councils should not enjoy that which the county boroughs enjoyed. The proposal of his hon. friend was to submit the question to the whole of the ratepayers. He could understand a *referendum* on the general principle if the House chose to abdicate its functions, but it was absurd to say that there should be a poll every time that it was proposed to exceed the 2d. limit.

MR. WALTER LONG said he did not think anyone would disagree with the general remarks made by the President of the Board of Education in regard to the provision to be made for education in its various grades for the children of the country. But if that was the policy of the House and of the country, the country should provide the cost and not leave other people to pay for it in their special localities where they did not derive the benefit of it. The right hon. Gentleman told them truly that the county boroughs were not exposed to this difficulty and the county council areas were. Did not any man who had had any experience of this education question as a part of local government know perfectly well that the conditions in a county borough were entirely and fundamentally different from those in a county? In a county borough what was wanted by part of it was wanted by the whole of it. But the county council had to govern an area which was extraordinarily different in its component parts. There were urban parts where the need for education was severely felt and the benefits arising from it were appreciated and made use of. The result was that the county council was tempted to make special educational provision in the urban parts of their areas which was paid for by the whole area including the rural parts. It was perfectly true that we wanted to link up our different systems of education, so that children in the elementary schools might have a fair chance of completing their education through its various grades. But if that was what Parliament wanted, why did it not do it itself? The hon. Member for Preston made the only proposal which was open for anyone to make on this Bill. They could not propose that the expense of secondary education beyond a fair and reasonable limit should be borne by the State. That could only be done by a Member of the Government. Therefore the hon. Member made the only practical propoasl that could be made. The Minister for Education had made the objection that the county council repeatedly appealed to the ratepayers now, and that if they exceeded a fair limit for secondary education, they could be turned out. That was perfectly true, but it was a poor satisfaction to the ratepayers who had to foot the bill. The right hon. Gentleman had dealt with this question as if it did not involve the question of the incidence of the rates. He believed, however, that there was a majority in the House who held that the rates as compared with Imperial taxes bore a larger share of the country's expenditure than they ought to do, and rates were growing all over the country. Everybody preached economy, and that the expenditure ought to be reduced; but on occasions of this kind the majority of the House were prepared to allow an increase of expenditure, because they conceived that they had excellent ideas as regards education. He would rather have seen the additional 2d. contributed out of the Imperial Exchequer. That could not be done at present, and therefore they were forced to adopt a less drastic scheme. An hon. Gentleman opposite had misrepresented him, unintentionally no doubt, by saying that he was afraid of popularly elected authorities. What he had said was that it was folly in the interests of the country to multiply popularly elected bodies; but, on the whole, popularly elected bodies were the most capable of looking after their own affairs. What was the proposal of the hon. Gentleman? It was that if the local authorities wanted to exceed that limit, they must appeal to the people who had elected them. Surely that was a theory which should appeal to the hon. Gentlemen opposite. [Ironical MINISTERIAL laughter.] He was astounded to hear that hon. Gentlemen opposite repudiated the idea that before spending the people's money the people were to be consulted. He believed in doing everything possible in the interests of education, and to arouse the interest of the people in education; but if they imposed on the ratepayers a burden greater than they could bear more would be done by that means than by any other to make education unpopular. The principle to be laid down was that a certain proportion of the burden of education should be borne locally, and the rest Imperially.

MR. OSMOND WILLIAMS (Merionethshire) said that the debate had given him more satisfaction than any which he had heard during the present session, and he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Minister for Education would stick to this clause through thick and thin. He considered it the best part of the Bill. In his own constituency, and in other parts of Wales, they had been paralysed more than once by the 2d. limit, and had it not been for the kind assistance they obtained from the Secretary to the Local Government Board they would have been in great difficulties. He was surprised that the working classes in England had not insisted on this matter of higher education as they had done in Wales. It was not the children of gentlemen they were thinking of, but the children of the poor, for whom they desired to provide the educational ladder by which they might go clear of expense from the elementary schools to the secondary schools and finally to the Universities. When they looked at the history of the Colonies and the great Dependencies of the Empire, they found that the majority of the men who had risen to eminence both in the political and the industrial spheres had been Scotsmen. He was quite prepared to make every allowance for the particular characteristics of his Scottish friends, but the real reason for this phenomenon was that for hundreds of years the sons of Scotland had been able to receive not only elementary but higher education; the Scottish Universities were truly national institutions to which the poorest of poor might resort. The English people ought to learn the lesson that education uplifted and enlarged the national life, and roused ambition to rise above the dead level of existence. They in Wales had felt this sixteen or seventeen years ago, and now they were beginning to realise its unmistakable value, and to reap the first fruits of the higher education which now formed part of the atmosphere which they breathed. England was still slumbering over this education question, and the great Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were, he believed, little known and hardly thought of by the common people. The truth was that the governing classes in England had never shown a real desire to support higher education, and the consequence was that successive Governments reflected the indifference of the classes from which they sprung in regard to the higher education of the people.

Sir PHILIP MUNTZ (Warwickshire, Tamworth) appealed to his right hon. friend to accept the Amendment which would make for economy of administration. Surely it was necessary and right that if an increase of the expenditure and consequent increase of the rates was contemplated the county council should appeal to the ratepayers in order to ascertain whether they approved of the step about to be taken. The ratepayer had to pay the increased rate and he ought to be consulted.

Mr. PAUL (Northampton) said he had been so demoralised by the debates on this Bill that he found it difficult to take any interest in anything except religion. The local authorities should be free to spend in the sense that this House was. They were responsible to their constituents and Parliament ought to be careful not to diminish the responsibility felt by these local authorities to the persons who elected them. That sense of responsibility would restrain them from wasting money far more effectively than any statute.

Sir WILLIAM ANSON supported the Amendment of the hon. Member for Preston. No one who had had experience of the working of the Education Act in rural counties could fail to be aware that the rate pressed so heavily on purely rural districts as to incline their representatives to look askance at the whole subject of education.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) said it appeared from the remarks of the hon. Member for Merionethshire that Wales for the last sixteen or seventeen years had enjoyed certain privileges, and the result was that Scotland had come to the front. ["Oh!"] Well, he was in the recollection of the House. On these matters opinions might change. An electorate to-day might think 2d. was a sufficient rate, but an electorate in the future might be of a different opinion, and therefore he thought the Amendment o the hon. Gentleman was right and that this matter should be dealt with by the electorate. It was because hon. Gentlemen opposite did not trust the electorate that they would not agree to this Amendment. The Amendment did not say what rate was to be paid, but that the electorate should decide it. While he believed with the hon. Baronet that this Bill would make the Party opposite unpopular in the country, he did not share the hon. Baronet's desire to avert that catastrophe; for that reason he supported the Amendment.

Mr. LAURENCE HARDY said they had heard a good educational speech from the hon. Gentleman opposite, but he did not think the terrors he depicted were so great as those of some hon. Gentlemen behind him. The actual fact of the limit was extremely valuable and was so regarded by the ratepayers in the counties. The accuracy of that was shown in the debate on Clause 26 when Member after Member pointed out the extreme difficulty of the rural districts making their voices heard on the county councils. It was really the voices of the urban districts which decided these matters, and that made it very undesirable that this limit should be taken away. The said limit would have been amply sufficient to fulfil the needs of the counties so far as secondary education was concerned, had it not been diverted to another purpose. A great deal of the money raised for secondary education was now absorbed by the teaching and training of teachers, and was not given to the real work of building up a secondary system of education so as to enable a child of merit to rise from the elementary to higher schools. It was the expense of training the teachers which was felt in the rural districts, and if this limit was taken off it would be felt to be a great hardship. At the present time county councils were training teachers, at great expense, whose services they had no right to demand or to retain, and if the intention of the Government was to throw this charge on the county councils, to enable them to raise a larger rate, some clause on the lines of Clause 34 was necessary, so that they should have power to retain the teachers. So far as this particular clause was concerned there was a strong mandate from the ratepayers that the cost of secondary education should fall not upon the rates, but that it should be an Imperial charge. He would prefer to see the clause omitted altogether, as he was convinced the opinion of all ratepayers was against it, but he was prepared to support the Amendment rather than there should be no Amendment at all.

And, it being half-past Ten of the Clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 90; Noes, 389. (Division List No. 215.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks. East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Macpherson, J. T.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall

Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Harold Cox and Sir Philip Muntz.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph E. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'wr Hamlets, S. Geo.)
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn)
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway)
Dewar, John A. (Invernes-sh.)
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel

Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A .(Donegal, W.)
Lea, HughCecil(St.Pancras, E.)
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul. Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye
Philipps, Col.Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, WalterRussell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thos. W. (Monm'th)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G.Scott(Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B..
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H.(SomersetE.
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley(Southamptn
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir ThomasPalmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewellyan(Carmarth
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon.C.H.W. (Hull,W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh,N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord(Norfolk,Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, SirJT.(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, Jamse Henry

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Mr. CHAIRMAN then proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of June 18th, to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of Clauses 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34, and of any Amendments thereto proposed by the Government, of which notice had been given.

Question put, "That Clause 29 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 391, Noes, 91. (Division List No. 216).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire)
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Sir John T. (Chesh.)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt, Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. S. (Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.

Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster)
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rdemond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, B. S. (Mile End)
Straus, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southamp'tn
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. James Mason and Mr. John Rutherford.

Clause 30 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 31 amended, and agreed to.

Clause 32 agreed to.

Clause 33:—

Question put, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 389; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 217).

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Abraham, Willaim (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins. W, Rylands D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. H. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp't
Benn, W. (T'wr Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J. H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James (Aberdeen

Bryce, J.A. (InvernessBurghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn. SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T.Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(SussexE.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.)
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col.Alan(Hereford,S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r'
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen, W.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb. Edmund G, Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lever, A. Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk Bghs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Arthur, William
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert

Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk,E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A, Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Rusesll (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thos. (W. Monm'th.)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Rt.Hn.E.(Dundee)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, SirC.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H.(Somerset)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn(Carmarthn
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, HonC.H.W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk,Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.Hugh O.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Hon. Guy (Winchester
Beach, Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt.Hn.SirJohn H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col.W
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareh'm
Lockwood, Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
M'Iver,Sir Lewis (EdinburghW
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Pease, HerbertPive(Darlington
Powell, SirFrancis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Ropner, Colonel Sir Robert
Rutherfrod, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool, Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.
Wilson, A.Stanley(York, E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Clause 34 disagreed to.

And, it being after Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) [ADVANCES].

Order for the House to be put into Committee read.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) objected.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he was not aware whether the hon. Gentleman who now objected knew that the Leader of the Opposition stated at Question time that he had no objection to the formal Resolution being taken.

MR. CLAUDE HAY again objected.

MR. JOHN REDMOND asked whether it would be too late for him to request the Leader of the Opposition kindly to repeat now to his follower behind him the expression of opinion he gave at Question time.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE LORD-LIEUTENANT OF IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.) said he would explain to the House the position of this matter. This was a Bill on which all parties were agreed. The Bill was going to the Grand Committee to-morrow, and it could not proceed unless this Resolution, which was purely formal, was passed.

SIR E. CARSON said that, so far as he was concerned, the reason why he objected to any facilities being given to this Bill was the way the Government had treated the Irish Unionist Members on equally important Bills—equally important for the labourers of Ireland and the development of the country. The Government had done all they could to prevent those Bills going through, and did it in the most offensive way.

MR. BRYCE: Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman say to what Bills he refers? I know of no such case.

SIR E. CARSON mentioned the Rathmines Bill and the Great Northern of Ireland Railway Bill, on the latter of which the President of the Board of Trade made a most offensive speech.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he still adhered to the opinion he gave at Question time. As he understood it, this was a matter which had been sent up to Grand Committee, and this was a technical step to carry that decision out. He was not prepared now to raise any objection to the course proposed. As the House very well knew, this was not an unprecedented incident in Parliamentary life. The power which individuals had of objecting was constantly used, and not always reasonably. When Mr. A. used that power unreasonably Mr. B. was apt to retaliate. When that kind of retaliation took place it was time for gentler spirits like himself to refrain.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked whether in the circumstances it was intended that the Committee should meet to-morrow. What did the Chief Secretary propose to do ? It was evident that they could not proceed with the Bill unless the Resolution was passed.

MR. BRYCE : I can only say——

MR. CLAUDE HAY : On a point of order. Is the right hon. Gentleman in order ?

*MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Bryce.

MR. BRYCE said that he still hoped that the voice of reason and good-feeling heard in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition would have influence on the right hon. Gentleman's followers. He was not aware of any case in which the Irish Government had thrown any difficulty in the way of any Bill relating to Ireland.

MR. CLAUDE HAY : I object.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked whether there was no means under the rules of the House whereby it was possible to prevent from being blocked by one Member a measure which had the general support of all parties, and which affected the well-being, and almost the life, of tens of thousands.

*MR. SPEAKER : I think the hon. Member is as well aware as I am of the rules of the House. Unless the Government choose to put down the order as first Government order it cannot be proceeded with under present circumstances.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR suggested that the Bill should be taken as the second order on Friday after the Motion for the suspension of the eleven o'clock rule.

MR. BRYCE said the suggestion would be considered. But the point which he wanted the House to realise was that the greatest difficulty would arise if the Grand Committee, which was summoned to meet to-morrow, had not the Bill to consider.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND : The sooner we get Home Rule the better.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL : We could not be worse than we are.

Committee deferred till To-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-six minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 12*th July*, 1906.

EARLDOM OF NORFOLK.

Committee for Privileges met: Counsel further heard in reply on behalf of the claimant, Lord Mowbray: The Attorney-General, K.C., M.P., heard on behalf of the Crown: Committee adjourned to Monday, the 23rd instant.

The Lord Inverclyde sat first in Parliament after the death of his brother.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: South Lincolnshire Water; Watford and Edgware Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill—Message from the Commons of Thursday last to be considered on Tuesday next.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn.

Todmorden Corporation Bill. Reported with Amendments.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill; Watford and Edgware Railway Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bills be now read 2ª; agreed to; Bills read 2ª accordingly.

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways Bill [H.L.], Newtownards Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]. Commons Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill. Committed for Tuesday next.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill. Brought from the Commons.

Sutton District Water Bill, South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill. Brought from the Commons, read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners.

Midland Railway Bill, Uxbridge Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill. Reported without Amendment.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to: Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed: The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Water Provisional Order Bill; St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill; Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of Working Classes) Bill; Poole Corporation Water Bill; Cork City Railways and Works Bill; Great Northern Railway Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Report from

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; (viz.), E. Stradbroke, L. Zouche, L. Borthwick, L. Castlemaine, L. Kintore. (*E. Kintore*) (Chairman); agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly: The Committee to meet on Tuesday next, at Eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill. Read 1^a; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 158.)

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION.

Petition in favour of denominational religious teaching in schools; of inhabitants of Firle signing; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Regulations for technical schools, schools of art, and other schools and classes for further education (from August 1st, 1906, to July 31st, 1907).

TRANSVAAL.

Further correspondence relating to labour in the Transvaal mines (in continuation of [Cd. 2819] February, 1906.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS (VENTILATION).

Appendix to Report of the Committee appointed to investigate and advise the First Commissioner of Works with regard to the improvement of the ventilation of the House of Commons.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3666. Portugal (Lourenço Marques).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

Crown Office—Rules, 1906.

PACIFIC CABLE ACT, 1901 (ACCOUNT 1905–1906).

Account showing the money issued from the Consolidated Fund under the provisions of the Pacific Cable Act, 1901, and the money received, expended, and borrowed, and securities created under the said Act, to March 31st, 1906; together with report of the Chairman of the Pacific Cable Board.

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES) (VISITING COMMITTEES).

Draft Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department under the Prison Acts, 1877 and 1898, with respect to the constitution of the visiting Committees of Bristol and Shepton Mallet Prisons.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Order made by the Council of the borough of Accrington, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the borough.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

GROUND GAME BILL.

House in Committee (according to order.)

[The Earl of Onslow in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2:—

Lord SALTOUN moved to amend Clause 2, which provided that the occupier of moorland and unenclosed land should be entitled to kill ground game at any period of the year otherwise than by shooting, by securing that there should be a close time between April 1st and September 1st. He said that he submitted the Amendment in the interest of preserving bird life at the stage when birds were breeding and were unable to protect themselves. Although he did not think that farmers as a general rule would go out of their way to do damage, there was very little doubt that disturbing birds while they were nesting by walking about the moors might do an infinite amount of harm. He had been in correspondence with a number of northern proprietors, and they were all agreed that the Bill required amendment in the way he proposed. Most of them would like to see the month of October included in the close time, but he suggested from April 1st to September 1st in the hope that the noble Lord in charge of the Bill would be able to see his way to accept the Amendment. In the Ground Game Act of 1880 there was a very long close time—he believed nearly six months. This provision was inserted not only for the protection of birds and game, but also to prevent difficulties arising between landlord and tenant. Shooting rents in the north were as five to one compared with grazing rents, so that if a landlord who had a small property and only got 1s. per acre for grazing purposes could get 5s. per acre in shooting rents, the temptation would naturally be for him to clear the ground of sheep and realise his shooting rents. He honestly thought it would be a great mistake to make it possible for ground game to be snared and trapped all the year round. He did not think farmers on the hillside would have any title to complain of the close time suggested in his Amendment, because they would be able to kill rabbits right up to the breeding time. They would be able to kill ground game from September to April, and surely that was sufficient time for their destruction. There were very few persons who wished rabbits and hares to be retained. They were both vermin, and should go. But he did think that for the protection of bird life it was desirable that there should be a close time during the few months in which they were breeding and were unable to protect themselves. For these reasons he moved his Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In line 3, to leave out the word 'April' and insert the word 'September.'"—(*Lord Saltoun.*)

LORD BURGHCLERE confessed that he wished it were possible to move the hard heart of his noble friend opposite, so that he might retain the Bill as it stood. He ventured to think there were many reasons why the Bill should be allowed to pass in its present form, and he was much encouraged in that belief by what fell from the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition at the previous stage when he said, and said with truth, that the farmer should not be left all these months without the advantage of being able to destroy the game which preyed on his crops. He (Lord Burghclere) admitted that the close time suggested by the noble Lord was the time during which rabbits and hares bred, but, agreeing as he did with what his noble friend had said as to rabbits and hares being vermin, he thought that rather an argument for permitting them to be trapped and snared during the breeding time. If it were possible to make an appeal to the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition or his followers to allow the Bill to pass in its present form, he would be inclined to make it. He did not believe that the Bill, if allowed to come into operation immediately as it was drawn, would do the slightest harm to the grouse moors in Scotland. He recognised to the full the importance of the grouse interest in Scotland not only from the point of view of the landlords, but also from the point of view of the people who lived in the neighbourhood. They were told that under this Bill the tenants would go on the land and disturb the grouse. The tenants had a perfect right to go on the grouse moors at the present moment. They had a right of entry, and he did not see what harm would be done by allowing them to snare and trap—not to shoot—the ground game which destroyed their crops. He had never heard of grouse being caught in a snare.

LORD SALTOUN said it was quite easy when they knew how to do it.

LORD BURGHCLERE said he was certainly not so clever at snaring as his noble friend. In view of the fact that his noble friend had behind him big battalions and would not listen to any appeal to withdraw the Amendment, he was afraid nothing remained for him but to accept it.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, the noble Lord who has just sat down made a kind of appeal to me to allow the Bill to pass in its present shape. Now I am the last person in the world to desire that this Bill should be altered in such a way as to prevent the extirpation of animals that I for one regard as mischievous intruders, and I certainly should not suggest to any noble Lords who sit on this side of the House that they should support the Amendment of the noble Lord behind me if that Amendment does not accord with their own convictions.

I think, however, we have a right to ask one or two questions. In the first place we should like to have a clear and unequivocal statement of the manner in which this point is regarded by His Majesty's Government. In the debate the other evening the noble Lord who on that occasion spoke in behalf of the Government, but who is not in his place to-night (Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), went out of his way to intimate to us that in the opinion of His Majesty's Government the Bill did stand in need of some alteration in the direction suggested by the Amendment. I was careful to look afterwards at the exact words he used, and they most clearly and distinctly intimated that in the opinion of noble Lords opposite it was desirable to alter the Bill at this point. So much, then, as to the view of His Majesty's Government, which I hope they will confirm and explain before this discussion closes.

There is another point which weighs very much with me. This is a Bill intended to meet the wishes of the occupiers of unenclosed lands principally, though not entirely, in Scotland. We do happen to know something of the views of this class of the community. I hold in my hand a Report of the proceedings of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, and I find that in 1905 a Resolution was moved by a gentleman, speaking apparently on behalf of the tenants, as follows:

> "That in order to mitigate the loss to sheep farmers by game, the Ground Game Act, 1880, should be amended so as to admit of rabbits being snared and trapped on moorland and unenclosed land from October 1st to April 1st."

That view was not expressed for the first time in 1905, because a precisely similar Resolution was carried in 1903 at a meeting of this Chamber of Agriculture. I take it, therefore, that in the view of the tenants they would be sufficiently protected by the privilege of killing rabbits between October 1st and April 1st. My noble friend behind me wishes to do rather more for them than that, because he throws in September. He is, therefore, really offering more than the tenants have asked for. That is how I understand the case to rest, and if it be still the view of His Majesty's Government, who presumably have made it their business to inquire fully into the circumstances of the case, that this clause stands in need of Amendment, and if I am right in believing that the Scottish tenants themselves do not desire that the privilege should be given to them during the whole twelve months of the year, then I must say the proposal of my noble friend seems to me to be a reasonable one, and I am inclined to support him.

Earl BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, I feel that I ought to apologise to the House for intervening in this discussion, for the reason that I have never had an opportunity of even shooting at a grouse in my life. I feel, therefore, somewhat ignorant of the merits of the case; but, on behalf of the Scottish Office and of His Majesty's Government, I am able to repeat the expression of their sympathy and general goodwill towards this Bill. On the other hand, in view of what has fallen from the noble Lord opposite and the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, I would venture to advise the noble Lord in charge of the Bill to accept the Amendment. If when this Amendment had been accepted it was found that any real grievance existed in the working of the Act the noble Earl himself could bring in a Bill to amend this one, and I am sure he would receive every support and sympathy from His Majesty's Government. But, in the circumstances, and having regard to what has fallen from noble Lords on the other side of the House, I think it would be well for my noble friend to accept the Amendment.

Lord JAMES of HEREFORD said it had become quite clear that his noble friend would have to accept the Amendment. But he would like to ask the House, and especially Lord Saltoun, to consider whether they were doing exactly the right thing in accepting the Amendment. The Act of 1880 was passed principally for the purpose of getting rid of anything approaching ill-feeling between landlord and tenant with respect to game, and the Act had certainly been successful in this respect. The landlord and the game tenant had the greatest protection in the goodwill of the occupation tenant. It was owing to that goodwill that no friction existed between the parties. The grievance of the tenant at the present moment was that for a great period of the year he was prevented from trapping the ground game which were doing damage to his crops. What was the shooting tenant going to get by preventing the occupation tenant from trapping ground game all the year round? He could go upon the land for the whole twelve months, and, if he had a grievance, if the goodwill which had hitherto existed were removed, he or his shepherd, by one movement of the foot, could inflict considerable damage on the shooting tenant by destroying the nest of the grouse. That was a state of things which might obtain if they lost the goodwill between landlord and tenant. It was said that the tenants might snare grouse. He had no doubt it was possible to lay snares for grouse, but not the rabbit snare; there was a well-known difference between the two. Again, what could be the object of snaring grouse in the months of May, June and July? What would the men who snared them do with them? For the sake of a mere fancied protection they were going to allow the tenant to have a grievance in that he would see his crops eaten and not be allowed to snare the rabbits. He did not suggest that their Lordships should divide on the Question, but he thought they would be taking the wiser course, in the interests of both landlord and shooting tenant, if they removed the grievance by allowing ground game to be trapped and snared all the year round.

LORD LOVAT supported the Amendment. He did not think there was likely to be any jealously or antipathy between landlord and tenant in this matter. Again, there was the question of rates. In some districts 40 per cent. of the rates came out of shooting values, and it would be a serious blow to the whole community if grouse rents were in any way injured, or prospective shooting tenants were deterred from taking grouse moors in the Highlands.

LORD BURGHCLERE agreed as to the very great value of grouse moors to Scotland. It was in the interests, or the supposed interests, of these grouse moors that the Amendment had been put forward and it was obvious that after the expression of opinion of the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition and of His Majesty's Government nothing remained for him but to accept the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clauses agreed to.

Bill recommitted to the Standing Committee; and to be printed as amended. (No. 157.)

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL [H.L.].

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^{a}."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

*LORD ALVERSTONE: My Lords, I am extremely sorry that I am not able to allow the Third Reading to pass without a few words of protest against the Bill as it now stands. I have no doubt that some of your Lordships will think I am acting somewhat ungraciously in the matter. It would have been far more congenial to me to have admitted that the Amendments which the Lord Chancellor has accepted met some of the objections that I was obliged to take to the Bill in its original shape, in which it was certainly incapable of being applied with justice. But I have had no opportunity whatever of pointing out to your Lordships, or through your Lordships to those who are interested in this matter, my objections to the Bill except on the present occasion, and therefore I ask your Lordships to permit me for a few minutes to call attention to four or five matters, and to point out that unless these points are dealt with in another place the measure will be one which cannot possibly be effectively worked.

I am not going to refer to any matters which could be dealt with by rule or which could be the subject of verbal amendment, but I am obliged to call attention to four or five matters which would arise under the working of the Bill as it now stands. Your Lordships now allow an application to be made by persons convicted for leave to appeal, and it is upon that that the present state of difficulty arises. You Lordships have not inserted in this Bill any provision at all for the release on bail of persons who either give notice of appeal or have a right of appeal given them. That is a most serious consideration. It cannot be cured by rule. At present, by the Statute law, no convicted person can be released on bail except under the provisions of the Crown Cases Reserved Act, which is actually repealed by this Bill.

What is the position to be? A man is imprisoned either at Cardiff, Liverpool, or Newcastle. There is no provision in this Bill as to how he is to make his application, no provision whereby he can either get out of prison or get aid in prison; and the result is that that part of the Bill must remain almost a dead letter except in the cases, as I ventured to mention to your Lordships on the last occasion, of rich criminals as compared with poor. It is the more remarkable that that most useful Act of Parliament, the Crown Cases Reserved Act, has been repealed. Under that Act there is given to a Judge power to state a special case, power to respite a sentence, and power to permit the prisoner to bail. In this Bill the only sentence that can be respited is the sentence of death.

I pass to another point which seems to me to have been overlooked by those who have no doubt been assisting my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack in the preparation of this Bill outside this House. I refer to the fact that no provision is inserted as to how the prosecutor is to be dealt with. That is an extremely important point when you see the practical working of this Bill. At present, in a great number of cases, orders are made for the restitution of goods. What is to happen with regard to those goods under this Bill? There is no provision for suspending the operation of these orders, and the consequence is that a prosecutor who is not going to be represented, or at any rate can only be represented at his own expense, will not know as to how these orders are to be dealt with.

But it touches a far broader question. What is to be position of the prosecutor? This Bill makes no provision for his costs. That is a really serious difficulty. The prosecutor, sometimes the police but more often a private individual who has been bound over to prosecute, will be obliged, if the case is properly conducted, to appear and bear his own expenses. If the Bill is to pass in its present form it is imperative that the State, through the Public Prosecutor, should take up the conduct of cases for the prosecution on appeal. That leads to another point governed by statute as to which this Bill makes no provision—the binding over of witnesses. Witnesses are bound over by the committing magistrate to give evidence at the trial, but, as this Bill stands at present, it provides for a new trial but makes no provision of any sort for securing the attendance of witnesses when the new trial is ordered. This is a very practical question in great seaports like Liverpool and Cardiff, because there are not a few crimes every year tried at these assizes which necessitate the attendance of seafaring witnesses, who are very difficult to obtain. It is essential, if this Bill is to be worked, that this provision should be amended. No rules that could possibly be made under the Bill would enable this difficulty to be got over.

The only provision in the Bill for legal assistance is in cases in which the Court of Appeal is of opinion that a prisoner requires it for the purpose of getting up his appeal and supporting his appeal before the Court. It will be absolutely essential, if the Bill is to have the effect in any number of cases that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack desires, that this should be dealt with by an alteration of statutes and not by a mere question of rule. There is another important point which seems to me to involve a question of principle. Power is now given by the Bill to convict a prisoner in his absence of an offence of which he has not been found guilty at the trial. The Bill provides that the Court of Appeal may sentence a man for a crime which he has not been found guilty of by the jury if the Court of Appeal thinks he is guilty of it, and that is done in the absence of the prisoner unless the Judges order the prisoner to be present. I submit that, as a matter of constitutional justice, the Bill ought to have been framed the other way. The prisoner should be present, and such an extraordinary anomaly as judgment in a criminal case behind a man's back should not appear on the Statue Book. This, again, is no mere theoretical grievance. If a prisoner is convicted behind his back of some offence with which he was not charged at the original hearing, it might at once be said that if he had known that this was to be charged against him he could have given an explanation.

The matters to which I have referred affect the working of the Bill as it is now framed. They are all matters that depend upon statute except the last one, which is a new provision in this Bill allowing a prisoner to be convicted in his absence, and they are matters which in my judgment must be considered before the Bill as now framed can possibly work. Ending as I began, I regret I cannot abate my objections to the Bill. I have never heard, from the beginning to the end of this discussion, any case made out for the proposed alteration in the law. If it is to be carried into effect, I do respectfully submit that it ought to be after this kind of legislation had been carefully examined by experts who are acquainted with the administration of this branch of the law; if necessary by some Departmental Committee or Select Committee that really could deal with the practical question. It is my duty most unwillingly to say that I believe the Bill as it leaves your Lordships' House to be unworkable, and I deeply regret that legislation in this shape on so important a matter as the criminal law should be sent down from your Lordships' House to another place.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I think your Lordships will feel that it is very unfortunate that my noble and learned friend's judicial duties have prevented him from attending and making these observations at the earlier stages of the Bill. We had the Committee stage and the Standing Committee stage, which lasted some time and in which the noble Earl the late Lord Chancellor and other noble and learned Lords took part, and at which, too, several of the matters referred to were considered. In regard to the other points to which my noble friend has referred, I have heard them for the first time now, and I believe, with all respect to my noble and learned friend, that his objections are unsound.

It is said that there is no provision for the release on bail of those who appeal. No; they have been convicted before a judge and jury, and I do not propose that they should be released on bail unless the Court of Appeal decides that they ought to have a new trial. I am paying respect to the decision of the Judge and jury by whom they have been convicted. They are not persons who are awaiting trial; they are persons who have been convicted, Let the appeal take place as soon as possible, but, until then, why not allow them to remain in prison after sentence has been passed? The next point raised was that there is no provision for applying for leave to appeal. There is. It is provided that rules can be made in regard to all notices of appeal. The next observation was, how is the prosecutor to be dealt with? He is one of those who may have notice given to him under the rules in accordance with one of the clauses of the Act. I did not understand the point made in regard to the restitution of goods. Until the appeal is settled and acquittal takes place the order for restitution stands good.

As to the binding over of witnesses to appear at the second trial, I should like to have had an opportunity of looking up the statute which provides for this matter, but my impression is that the recognisances would be binding at the second trial. If they are not the witnesses could be again summoned, if available, for the second trial, and if they are not available they could not be forthcoming whether you have recognisances or not. The provision with regard to punishment for a minor offence on a conviction for a major offence was discussed in Committee in the presence of the noble and learned Earl the late Lord-Chancellor, who is the greatest criminal authority in this country. That provision is intended for this kind of case. Suppose a man is convicted of murder, and the Court of Appeal does not think he is guilty of murder but of the lesser offence of manslaughter, they may then convict him of manslaughter. The exact wording of the clause is—

> "Where an appellant has been convicted of an offence and the jury could on the indictment have found him guilty of some other offence, and on the finding of the jury it appears to the

Court that the jury must have been satisfied of facts which proved him guilty of some other offence, the Court may, instead of allowing or dismissing the appeal, substitute for the verdict found by the jury a verdict of guilty of such other offence, and pass such judgment in substitution for the judgment passed at the trial as they think proper."

What does that mean? If the Court thinks that the person convicted has not been guilty of the greater offence of murder but has been guilty of manslaughter, then they may reduce the sentence to one for manslaughter. That is all that is meant. I do not see any great harm in that. For my part I think it is a sensible provision.

LORD ALVERSTONE: I did not object to that. I objected to the absence of the prisoner.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The other point raised by the noble and learned Lord is the absence of the prisoner. It would be very difficult alway to require that the prisoner should be present whenever he thinks proper to appeal. It would be a very serious matter to bring up prisoners in this way. It must be remembered that the man has been already convicted. You are giving him another chance; you allow him to either send in a document to the Court asking them to reconsider the case or to appear by counsel, and you authorise the Court of Appeal to say he shall be present in person if necessary. He having been convicted, the country should not be put to the expense of bringing the prisoner up to the Court in order to hear the arguments, because there are not witnesses, except in rare instances, to be heard. It is reasonable to say that the prisoner shall not be brought up under these circumstances unless the Court thinks he ought to be. I have now come to the end of the criticisms of the Lord Chief Justice, and I think everybody will agree that they are substantially Committee points.

I wish to express my gratitude for the assistance I have received from many noble Lords in the passage of this Bill. I believe the Bill to be a good one and to be sincerely desired outside by people of all opinions. I have valued from the commencement the criticisms directed against it, and I think I may say that except on minor, I might almost say minute points, there have only been two things said against the principle of this Bill. The first is the objection to the expense. I do not believe there will be any expense to speak of. If there was an expenditure of £10,000 or £15,000 a year, it would be perfectly insignificant in comparison with the object attained. The second argument, one which has not been renewed, is that juries when they thought there was going to be an appeal would cease to do their duty with the same vigilance as before. I believe there is no foundation whatever for that statement. I refrain from answering the numerous criticisms which have been made outside, not always in temperate language, and I am glad to think that opinion has now come round to the belief that the Bill is a good one, and is, on the whole, destined to be a valuable addition to the statute law of this country.

On question, Bill read 3^a; an Amendment (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

SPEECHES OF IRISH MAGISTRATES.

LORD MUSKERRY rose to call attention to the disloyal and violent speeches of certain magistrates in Ireland, and to the manner in which they had incited the people to commit illegal and criminal acts; and also to the fact that certain of these magistrates were members of disloyal organisations, and had attended meetings of these bodies, where not only disloyal but also illegal and criminal proceedings were advocated; and to move for Papers.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, on the Second Reading of the Justices of the Peace Bill about a fortnight ago, the subject of the appointment of Irish magistrates was brought forward. My noble friend the Marquess of Londonderry instanced certain points in connection with this matter; and my noble and learned friend Lord Ashbourne informed your Lordships of the policy he adopted in appointing new magistrates, telling you that his procedure was to request them to state what petty sessions they proposed to attend. I also gather that he suggested it might be a good thing that the Lord High Chancellor should make himself acquainted with the Irish procedure in these matters. I am perfectly in accord with my noble and learned friend in that. I think it would not only be advisable that the Lord High Chancellor should make himself acquainted with the Irish procedure, but also that every one in England who is interested in the proper administration of justice should make himself acquainted with what is happening in Ireland. Although my noble and learned friend told you what his custom was, he omitted to inform you why that custom was adopted. I am inclined to believe that it was adopted simply owing to the new class of magistrates.

LORD ASHBOURNE: The practice was not introduced by me. It existed long before my time.

LORD MUSKERRY: At any rate it did not exist twenty years ago. It was realised that, unless such a restriction was placed upon these new magistrates, the result, in many cases, would be an absolute failure in the impartial administration of justice, owing to these magistrates attending in overwhelming numbers at any petty sessions where there were cases being tried connected with the interests of either the agrarian or the nationalist movements. The following is an example. At a meeting of the Clare County Council, held on the 13th of last month, Mr. James O'Doherty, J.P., referred to the small number of Nationalist magistrates they had in East Clare. He said that—

> "On more than one occasion he had been brought with Mr. Hogan and Mr. McInerney to fight the hirelings of Dublin Castle, and he never refused to attend any petty sessions in the interests of justice. But he should say that were it not for Mr. McInerney and Mr. Hogan he would be quite useless on many an occasion."

The interpretation which your Lordships and I think most people in this country would give to the word "justice" is different from Mr. O'Doherty's.

I do not propose to take up your Lordships' time by going into all the speeches that have been made. I only intend to take extracts from one or two as samples of the reprehensible language which is being freely used. I would draw the attention of your Lordships to the utterances of Mr. Conor O'Kelly, J.P. He addressed a meeting at Barhave, near Belmullet, on October 1st, 1905, held for the purpose of intimidating a farmer named John Padden, who held possession of a farm from which the previous tenant had been evicted. Mr. O'Kelly said—

> "I have come to denounce Padden. I have denounced him. It is for you now to put my words into practice. I hope that before I leave Belmullet a vigilance committee will be appointed, and the work of that committee will be to report to another committee I intend also to form every single man, woman or child, who has any intercourse of any sort or kind with this nefarious grabber. Any man that talks to him at a fair, or market, or meeting place is to be branded as bad as himself, if not worse."

As a result of this terrorising speech the unfortunate John Padden at once gave up his farm. It would not have been safe for him to have retained it. Mr. James Mills, J.P., was chairman of the meeting at which Mr. Conor O'Kelly spoke, and at its close he also addressed those present in the following terms—

> "Men of Barhave, Mr. O'Kelly and Mr. O'Dowd have spoken at some length to you on the National question; have spoken to you in such a way that I trust that you will follow their advice; the land question will soon be settled."

On May 27th last, Mr. Conor O'Kelly, J.P., addressed a meeting at Callow, near Swinford, county Mayo, held for the purpose of intimidating a local bailiff named Thomas Durkin, popularly known as "Tom Watt." And this is what Mr. O'Kelly said—

> "There are many grabbers in Mayo, but what did we do with the grabber of Ballyheane? And what did we do with Padden down in Erris? They prosecuted us for that also, but it failed. They will have to prosecute us again if this wretched creature does not give up the land he should never have touched. If you mean business, let no man in this parish be contemptible enough to have any dealings or any intercourse with Tom Watt."

The immediate result following this speech was that on June 4th, Thomas Durkin found his mare dead, mutilated in the most shocking manner, apparently with a knife. At a meeting of the South Galway Executive of the United Irish League on November 13th, 1904, Mr. P. J. Kelly said—

> "He often thought on learning of the extravagant prices being paid (for land) that the people must be gone mad. Some of these people deserved to be shot down as John Blake had been shot, and the revolver was there still. Whenever a man was found going into the enemy's camp, he should be brought down."

At a meeting held at Loughrea, on December 29th, 1904, Mr. P. J. Kelly said—

> "At the outset of the negotiations he advocated the rifle and the sword, and there was no going behind. What use were they unless they were bound like an army, and bound by their duty in the field, and if a soldier deserted in the field he would be shot like a dog, and deserved to be so shot. And he (Mr. Kelly) now said that if there were renegades on the Clancarty estate they would be, and deserved to be, shot down like dogs if they broke through their pledge and deserted their ranks."

On the following 13th of June Mr. P. J. Kelly became, a Chairman of the Loughrea District Council, *ex officio* a Justice of the Peace. He had been a magistrate previously. This Mr. Kelly has since delivered several other violent speeches. At a meeting of the United Irish League, held on March 11th, 1906, he said—

> "They, as men who had fought and suffered for God's poor, would continue to fight for them, and the bishops had no right to dictate to them. If necessary, they would be proud to go out again with the rifle or the blunderbuss to plant the people on the soil."

I would remind your Lordships that these *ex officio* magistrates have to take exactly the same oath as those gentlemen who are appointed in the ordinary way to the Commission of the Peace.

At a meeting held at Enniscorthy on May 28th, 1905, Sir Thomas H. G. Esmonde, J.P., said:—

> "We are the descendants of the rebels of '98. We are many of us still suffering for the sacrifices of our forefathers made 107 years ago. We honour them all the more on that account. We hold their memory in all the greater reverence. Their principles are our principles; their beliefs are our beliefs; their ideals are our ideals; and, led by the inspiration which animated them, we declare that we will never submit to foreign rule in Ireland, and that we will never cease from struggling, by whatever means seem best to us, until Ireland is free from the centre to the sea. This solemn pledge we renew to-day. And we pledge our faith once more by the memory of '98."

These gentlemen have taken the oath to be faithful and bear true allegiance to the King and also the oath of office. My Lords, do you think that people can be relied upon to administer justice fairly and truly when they show, both in words and actions, such absolute disregard for the solemn obligations into which they have entered?

I would like to refer briefly to the disloyal societies which at present exist in Ireland. Your Lordships all know of the United Irish League, and probably you have formed your own opinions as to the category in which that body should be placed. But there is one body of which, I believe, your Lordships have not heard, and that is an organisation called the Ancient Order of Hibernians. Now, this society poses as a purely benevolent association, and was, I understand, registered as such in February, 1905. Mr. Joseph Devlin, who is a Member of Parliament and the National President of the Order, said that some of the best support which Mr. Redmond received in Australia was received from the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and they had guaranteed £1,000 to the contribution which was then being raised in aid of the General Election. I was under the impression—I may be mistaken—that action of this description was outside the power of any benevolent society, and that it would be considered as a misappropriation of their funds. No doubt noble Lords learned in the law will be able to set me right in regard to this point. To show what this Ancient Order of Hibernians really is, I will quote from the words of Mr. John Dillon (National Vice-President of the Order) and from other officers. Mr. Dillon, at a meeting of the Order held at Drummulan, county Tyrone, on March 17th, 1905, speaking on the history of the Order, said—

> "The Hibernians were then known as Ribbonmen."

At a meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians at Creslough, county Donegal, on March 17th last, the Vice-President of the local divisions of the Order, who presided, said—

> "The defenders became known as the Ribbonmen . . . It was then (in the nineteenth century) that they became known under the title of the Ancient Order of Hibernians."

The National Secretary of the Order, at a meeting of Hibernians held at Castleblayney, county Monaghan, on October 21st, 1905, said that—

> "In those days the combination assumed many names, Molly Maguires, and Ribbonmen."

I do not know if any of your Lordships have ever heard of the Ribbonmen's oath, which members of that society have to take. I hold it in my hand, but it is far too long to read in its entirety, and I will quote only a few paragraphs from it. I may say that the whole of the oath is couched in terms equally as strong as the words which I now quote—

> "And I further swear to owe no allegiance to any Protestant or heretic Sovereign, Ruler, Prince, or Potentate, and that I will not regard any oath delivered to me by them or their subjects, be they judge, magistrate, or else, as binding.
>
> "And I swear to aid as best I can, any brother or brothers who may be on trial for any act or expression of theirs, before magistrate, judge, jury, or else, and to be ready at all times to aid by every means in my power in preserving his or their liberation; and, if myself a witness, to disregard any oath delivered to me on such occasions by judge, jury, magistrate, counsel, lawyer, official, or else, and that I will not regard such oath as binding.
>
> "And in revenge for the sufferings of our forefathers and protection of our rights, I further solemnly swear to aid as best I can in exterminating and extirpating all Protestants and heretics out of Ireland or elsewhere; to hunt, pursue, shoot, and destroy all Protestant or heretic landlords, proprietors or employers, and also to hunt, shoot, pursue and destroy all landlords or proprietors belonging to the Church of Rome, should he or they evict his or their tenants from the house, land, home, or holding of theirs."

At a meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, held at Moy, on April 16th last, one of the officials said—

> "The organisation was formed for the purpose of driving the English Government and garrison out of this old land of ours."

And another official said—

> "There were at the present time about 380,000 members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians."

The character of this organisation may be gathered from the action of seven Roman Catholic priests residing in Pennsylvania, who, on October 3rd, 1874, signed a united declaration in which they stated that—

> "Experience has proved that no faith is to to be placed in the most solemn promises or denials of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. It is certain that a fear, terror of punishment, that may in secrecy be decreed in upper circles, compels members to execute commands given under the countersign, no matter how repugnant to the laws of God and man those commands may be. Evidence sufficient to convince the most sceptical has come to light that works forbidden by the commandment 'Thou shalt not kill' are traceable to the Ancient Order of Hibernians."

I will now show your Lordships the connection between the Ancient Order of Hibernians and the United Irish League. A gentleman holding high office in the Ancient Order of Hibernians as "National Delegate," said, at a meeting of the Order, that—

> "Every man who joined the Ancient Order of Hibernians was expected to be a member of the United Irish League, and for his part he would admit no man as a Hibernian who was not a member of the League. . . . The A. O. H. conferred many benefits on its members. In the first place, as he had already pointed out, it was a most valuable force behind the national organisation the wide world over."

Mr. Joseph Devlin, who, as a Member of Parliament, has taken the oath of allegiance to the King, is President of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and also Central Secretary of the United Irish League. Now, my Lords, as regards the object of the United Irish League, at meetings of which magistrates have presided and spoken, and of which body many of them are members, I only propose to read you a very few extracts, which will reveal the real character and aim of the organisation. At a meeting of the League at Ballingarry, county Limerick, Mr. James Lynam, official organiser, said—

> "God helps those who help themselves, and the evicted tenants will have to stir up and make it a hell upon earth for their enemies. He was glad to have the privilege of standing beside the great Father Casey, and he could say that if they had a man like him in every parish they could sweep away the English Government in a short time."

After the declaration of the poll at the election for East Tyrone, on January 24th, 1906, a meeting was held at which Mr. James Mullin, a solicitor and Justice of the Peace, in the course of an address, said—

> "They had been called rebels. Well, if a man who was true to his country and opposed to British rule was a rebel, then he was one."

I have in my hand a list of magistrates who have taken part in meetings of the United Irish League. It is far too long to read to your Lordships, but I should say that the greater number of them are *ex-officio* magistrates. There are twenty-two of them, however, who hold the Commission of the Peace, seventeen of whom are members of the United Irish League.

There is another disloyal society—the Sinn Fein. I will read an extract from an article on the Sinn Fein policy, which shows the aims of the Nationalists as regards the magisterial Bench—

> "But one civil department Ireland must completely capture when her people are properly disciplined, and when, moreover, her campaigning fund is sufficiently strong—namely, the legal department; because the administration of the law is almost as important as legislation itself for the welfare of the national government. This capture when the national fund can bear the strain will be easily effected. . . . All magistrates would be called on to resign as English officials, and would be at once restored as Irish magistrates. If any refused to resign others would take their place. All Nationalist lawyers who would be willing to accept them would get equal positions and salaries under the Irish Government."

Now, my Lords, in this House some years ago a measure giving Home Rule to Ireland was brought forward. It was thrown out, and the opinion of the country endorsed the action of your Lordships upon that occasion. Since then a modified form of Home Rule has been granted to Ireland, and the present results of that modified form of Home Rule are showing, day by day, how sound was the judgment of your Lordships in rejecting the full measure that was proposed. We are constantly being shown how little chance there is, even now, of fair play and fair treatment being given to the loyal minority of our fellow-subjects in Ireland. We have an example of the class of magistrates who have been brought into existence by this legislation—a class of magistrates who seem to imagine that the office they hold is to be used, not for the administration of pure and impartial justice between His Majesty's lieges, but simply as a political instrument to encourage and support the cause of disloyalty and crime in the country.

The boast and pride of this country have been in the uprightness, the fairness, and the impartiality of our Judges. When I say this country, I mean the United Kingdom, for I do not think that the members of the high judicial bench in Ireland yield in any one way to their learned brethren on this side of the Channel who occupy the same high positions. Your Lordships will have seen what the object of the Nationalists really is, and have realised that they desire to have the appointment to these high judicial offices entirely in their own hands in Ireland; the first requisites for these appointments being, not learning, honesty and uprightness, but that they should be Nationalists and support the objects of the United Irish League. You have an example of this among the present *ex-officio* magistrates. No one who has a regard for the welfare of the country can look upon this prospect with equanimity. The Commission of the Peace in Ireland has been degraded, and the administration of justice at petty sessions has been brought into contempt.

THE EARL OF MAYO: No.

LORD MUSKERRY: In many cases it has. On this point I cannot agree with my noble friend. If this sort of thing be permitted to continue, the administration of the law at petty sessions will soon become a perfect farce. It would be far better once and for all to do away with such a thing as the Commission of the Peace in Ireland, and let the resident magistrates alone administrate justice at the petty sessions.

My Lords, I move for a Return of the names of those appointed to the Commission of the Peace in the past twelve months, and also the names of those who, during that period, have occupied the position of magistrates through holding certain appointments which entitled them to that position *ex-officio.* I would also like to have an exact statement of what disqualifies anyone from holding the Commission of the Peace or acting as a magistrate. If we are to understand that, as the law now stands, any one who is elected to certain chairmanships or positions in Ireland making him *ex-officio* a Justice of the Peace is to be allowed to occupy that position no matter what his previous records or offences against the law may have been, and that he cannot be removed from a magistracy unless he commits similar offences while holding that position, I think your Lordships will agree with me that it is high time some change should take place in the laws regulating such appointments. I beg to move for Papers.

Moved, for a Return of magistrates who have been appointed in Ireland during the last twelve months.—(*Lord Muskerry*).

*LORD DENMAN: My Lords, five months of what I think will be remembered as a momentous and eventful session have gone by, and this is the first notice affecting the Government of Ireland which has appeared on the Notice Paper of your Lordships' House. This, I am informed, constitutes a record, and is, I think, a matter of congratulation for the House of Lords and the Irish Office, and more especially, perhaps, for the representative of that Office in this House. And now that a Question has been asked it does not appear, from the rather sparsely populated nature of the Benches of your Lordships' House, that it has aroused any general interest.

I regret that on this, the first occasion it is my duty to reply in this House for the Government of Ireland, I am obliged to enter a protest against the form in which the Notice has been placed upon the Paper. If your Lordships will glance at the Notice you will see that it is to—

> "call attention to the disloyal and violent speeches of certain magistrates in Ireland—and to the fact that certain of these magistrates are members of disloyal organisations."

Could any Notice be vaguer or more indefinite than that? Yet the noble Lord uses this very vague Notice as a peg on which to hang a debate on matters which, though very important, are essentially matters of detail, and matters which, if investigated, have to be inquired into, each case upon its merits.

I would remind your Lordships that this is in great contradistinction to the method the noble Lord employs in the admirable work which he does on behalf of the mercantile marine of this country in your Lordships' House. In the Notices which he then places upon the Paper he is, at any rate so far as the Question is concerned, always definite and precise as to the exact nature of the information he requires. In his Notices he tells us, for example, what happened when the three-masted schooner "Mudlark" went aground off Southend, and what the captain said to the Lascar at the wheel of the "Saucy Kipper." My noble friend who represents the Board of Trade is therefore able to come down with a neat answer in his pocket, and everybody is satisfied. On this occasion the noble Lord has gone into questions of great detail, of which I contend he has not given me proper notice. He asks me, I presume, to discuss with him across the Table what Mr. O'Doherty said to Mr. Hogan, and what Mr. Conor O'Kelly is reported to have said at Belmullet. I contend that such a course is unfair, not only to myself and to the Government of Ireland, but more particularly to the Lord Chancellor within whose jurisdiction such cases as these would naturally fall. Therefore, I must respectfully decline to discuss the details of these cases across the floor of the House unless the noble Lord takes the trouble to give me adequate notice of each particular case he proposes to raise.

There was one case he touched on, of which I happen to have particulars—the case of Mr. P. J. Kelly. Mr. Kelly, speaking at Loughrea, is reported to have said that they would be prepared to go out again with the rifle and the blunderbuss to plant the people on the soil. With regard to that case, it appears that this meeting was held within closed doors, and there was no evidence to show whether the language was in fact used. No complaint was made by any person to the Lord Chancellor in reference to it, nor had he any evidence on which he could take action. The noble Lord concludes his Notice by a motion for Papers. If I grasped correctly what he said I understand that he requires a list of *ex-officio* magistrates who have been appointed during the last twelve months.

LORD MUSKERRY: And other magistrates.

*LORD DENMAN: I take it he can get the names of the *ex-officio* magistrates in the ordinary course by referring to any Irish book of reference. With regard to the names of magistrates otherwise appointed he has given me no notice that he proposed to move for this information, and therefore I must first communicate with the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. I do not, however, imagine that he will have any objection to furnishing the list; but, before I can give the noble Lord any definite reply on that point, I must consult my learned friend. The noble Lord has quoted some extravagant and violent language alleged to have been used in different places, and he has dubbed certain gentlemen and certain associations disloyal. I will venture to remind your Lordships that violent language is not confined to Ireland. There are other parts of the Empire—possibly some of the Colonies and possibly at home in Hyde Park — where violent language is frequenty used, and if the Government were to take notice of every expression of violent language——

THE EARL OF MAYO: This is a case of violent language by magistrates.

*LORD DENMAN: If the Government were to take notice of every violent expression used by prominent gentlemen I think they would have their hands very full, and they would be rather serving the end of these gentlemen, some of them agitators, if they made heroes or martyrs of them by initiating prosecution against them. Apparently the noble Lord desires us to pay particular attention to these matters at a time when the country is unusually tranquil. I believe Ireland has not been so tranquil for a considerable period. The noble Lord told us about the oath of the Ancient Order of Hibernians.

LORD MUSKERRY: The oath of the Ribbonmen, who were the former Ancient Order of Hibernians.

*LORD DENMAN: The noble Lord made our flesh creep with the horrible oath which the members appear to take against all landlords, Catholic or Protestant, in the country. I see several Irish landlords opposite who have survived the oath which the Ancient Order of Hibernians have taken; and, looking at the very tranquil state of the country at present, I do not think it is necessary for the Government to take cognisance of all these matters. If proof were wanted that the country is in a tranquil condition I would point to the Summer assizes which are now proceeding. The addresses of the Judges of Assize to the grand juries at the opening of the assizes in the different counties show, so far as they have yet gone, that not only do the calendars contain unusually few cases for trial, but that the counties generally are in a satisfactory and orderly condition. I have here a long list of extracts from Judge's addresses at different assizes in Ireland. In West Meath the Judge remarked upon the very satisfactory condition of things; in Louth he said the county was in a highly satisfactory state; in Sligo he congratulated the grand jury on the condition of the country; in Limerick City the Judge had white gloves, there being no cases; and in Roscommon he referred to the fact that the county was free from serious crime. I could

quote more cases such as this, but I will refrain from taking up too much of your Lordships' time.

I would only add one or two remarks generally on behalf of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. He instructs me to say that there is no danger of any person being appointed to the Commission of the Peace against whom any evidence of illegal or disloyal action exists. The Lord Chancellor before he makes an appointment always obtains independent reports as to the suitability and good character of the candidate, and it may be mentioned that almost every appointment that he has made since he came into office has been on the recommendation of the Lords-Lieutenant of counties, the names having been in nearly all cases submitted to them by the Lord Chancellor for consideration. What possibly is more relevant to the question raised by the noble Lord is that whenever a case of language inciting to illegality or illegal or disloyal action is brought under his notice, supported by reasonable evidence, he will not hesitate to deal with it. That is all I am able to say in response to the remarks of the noble Lord. If he will give me notice of particular cases I shall be glad to obtain detailed information with regard to them, but I think he must see that it is quite impossible for me to answer at a moment's notice questions of which it is impossible for me to know the details.

As this is the first opportunity on which I have been able to speak for this Department I would like to say one word generally with regard to our discussions of Irish questions in this House. I am well aware that besides the Irish representative Peers there are many noble Lords who are owners of large estates and have other great interests in the country, and other noble Lords, like the noble and learned Lord Lord Ashbourne and the noble Marquess Lord Londonderry, who have had great experience of Irish legislation; and I take this opportunity of informing them that I shall always be glad to obtain any information possible with regard to questions which they may choose to raise, that I shall listen with the closest attention to any criticisms they may bring against the policy of the Government of Ireland, and that I shall make it my business personally to bring those criticisms to the notice of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, from whom I know well they will meet with that close consideration that expert criticism always merits. For the reasons I have just given to your Lordships I hope the noble Lord will not press his Motion for Papers. Possibly he will refer again on a future date to the matter, when I shall be able to give him a more definite Answer. As it is, I am obliged to decline to accede to his request.

THE EARL OF MAYO: My Lords, the noble Lord who has just sat down entered a protest against the way in which the Notice had been placed on the Paper. I have heard a great many Answers given to Irish Questions in this House, but this is the first time in my recollection that in those Answers allusions have been made in a comic manner to other Notices that have appeared on the Paper. I regard the noble Lord's humorous allusions to the "Mudlark" and the "Saucy Kipper" as entirely out of place. I would much rather have had a typewritten Answer read such as we have been accustomed to hitherto. I admit that the noble Lord who has called attention to this matter did not make out a very strong case with regard to the magistrates, but it must be remembered that there are people in Ireland who take a much more serious view than do noble Lords opposite of what magistrates say. I do not see why the simple Return for which the noble Lord has moved should be refused. I think it would have been more courteous if the noble Lord had stated in his reply the number of magistrates appointed, *ex officio* and otherwise. I was glad to hear the very satisfactory statement which the noble Lord was instructed to make as to the attitude taken up by the Lord Chancellor in this matter.

*LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, I rise to make only one or two remarks in regard to the discussion which has taken place. There are over 4,000 magistrates in Ireland, yet only four have been actually named by the noble Lord. I admit others have been referred to in a general way. In this matter it has to be borne in mind whether the magistrate is an ordinary county magistrate or an *ex officio* magistrate, and whether the words attributed to him were made use of at a time when he was actually a magistrate. It is not competent for the Lord Chancellor to sit in judgment on the elections which have made them *ex officio* magistrates. It is provided in the Local Government Act that persons who are placed in certain positions shall become *ex officio* justices of the peace. It is not in the province of the Lord Chancellor to object to the election because it carries with it a magisterial appointment. The Local Government Act mentions certain disqualifications, but speeches made before elections are not included among them.

I gather from the observations of the noble Lord who represents the Irish Office in this House that the Lord Chancellor of Ireland has given a very clear statement of his views, and that he will not make an appointment unless perfectly satisfied of the propriety of it. That is all that the Lord Chancellor can do as to making appointments. As I have mentioned, he has no power to sit in judgment on the elections which have made *ex officio* magistrates or to consider whether they were such appointments as he would himself have made. He has only power to appoint ordinary county magistrates with regard to whose appointment he has been in correspondence with the Lord-Lieutenant of the county. The noble Lord has stated that the present Lord Chancellor has not made any appointments except on the recommendation of Lords-Lieutenant, and he has indicated the line he will adopt in making these appointments in the future, and the inquiries he will think it right to make in reference to them.

The desire of the noble Lord who introduced this discussion was, I take it, to elicit a statement as to what would be the attitude of the Government in reference to magistrates who made disloyal, improper, and unbecoming speeches. In reference to that matter, the present Lord Chancellor, equally with those who have filled the office before him, can only deal with each case as it arises in reference to its own facts and special circumstances; and we have the assurance that the Lord Chancellor is quite alive to the importance of the matter, and will consider carefully every case that is brought to his notice and endeavour to do what is just and fair. I think we have every reason to be satisfied with that declaration.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, the notice of the noble Lord was not in any set terms an attack on the present Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and I am sure he did not mean it to be. But it did involve some reflection upon the manner in which my learned friend the present Lord Chancellor had exercised his discretion in these matters. Therefore I am grateful to the noble and learned Lord who has just sat down for having put the case so clearly in regard to the position of the Lord Chancellor in relation to the *ex officio* bench. It is, of course, perfectly possible that a man may become an *ex officio* magistrate of whom individually the Lord Chancellor may not have a very high opinion, and whom he would not *proprio motu* have been disposed to place on the Bench. But as the noble and learned Lord very truly pointed out, any previous utterances of such a man cannot in any way come under the cognisance of the Lord Chancellor, and therefore it would be exceedingly unfair to blame him for anything which was said except when the supposed culprit was actually exercising the functions of a magistrate.

I feel bound, having had the pleasure of serving for three years with the present Lord Chancellor in the Government of Ireland, to say that I know no man who would be less likely to overlook or ignore any disqualification of the kind mentioned by the noble Lord in his Motion, and no man who would be more likely to take a severe view either of seditious utterances or of utterances of any kind which could lead to the perpetration of crime. But in these matters there are two considerations to be borne in mind, one of which I think appeals to anybody who has lived in Ireland, and the other to all who have been concerned in Irish Government. In the first place, it must be remembered that the general scale of expression in Ireland is a great deal higher than it is in England. The superlative degree is habitually used in all transactions of life. Whether a man is describing a political opponent, or endeavouring to transact the sale of a horse, the superlative degree is used, whereas in this colder climate the positive suffices. That is one consideration to be borne in mind.

There is another consideration which appeals to everybody who has had to do with the Government of Ireland. It is this, that it often becomes a matter of very anxious thought for those concerned in Irish Government whether it is wise to take notice of particular utterances, however mischievous and reprehensible they may be in themselves, without most carefully weighing the individual circumstances of every case. In the first place, there is the point to which my noble friend drew attention—the condition of the country. When the country generally is in the satisfactory condition, which I am glad to believe Ireland is in at present, it may not be always wise to take notice of utterances which, in a more disturbed state of the country, would be in themselves infinitely more dangerous and would have to be checked at once. Again, the local importance and character of the man who makes the mischievous speech has very often to be taken into account. If he is a man who carries little weight, a local crank, perhaps, or a man of the kind Sir Wilfred Lawson once described as "total non-abstainers," he may make very foolish and reprehensible speeches and very little harm is done. On the other hand, when anything of a mischievous sort is said by a man who really carries weight in his own neighbourhood, who is a local leader, then it may be proper to take very much more serious notice of it.

I am quite certain that the present Lord Chancellor of Ireland bears all these considerations in mind, and that your Lordships will be perfectly safe in leaving this particular matter in his hands. There is no risk that he will make unwise appointments, or that he will be disposed to overlook improper utterances on the part of present occupants of the Bench. I am sure my noble friend behind me did not mean to be anything but courteous in his reply as regards the Paper asked for. I do not think it would be worth while to print at the public expense a Return of these magistrates and circulate it to your Lordships generally, but I have no doubt that if it will be any satisfaction to the noble Lord my noble friend will be happy to acquire the information and give it to him privately or in reply to a further question.

*THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: My Lords, I confess I do not wonder at those who have been closely associated with Ireland for many years putting questions of this sort when they read the reprehensible speeches made in that country by occupants of the magisterial Bench. Although, as my noble and learned friend Lord Ashbourne has pointed out, the utterance of only a few magistrates have been quoted to-night, it must not be forgotten that speeches of this kind in the past have had a very serious effect upon the prospects, happiness, and comfort of the people in the districts in which they have been made. The noble Earl the Lord President of the Council, who has occupied the position of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, knows full well that I am not exaggerating on that matter, and I do not think he will contradict me when I say that Lord Ashbourne when Lord Chancellor either removed from the Bench or reprimanded magistrates who made use of language of a reprehensible character during the time I was Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

I endorse what has been said as to the desire of the present Lord Chancellor of Ireland to deal justly in this matter. I have been in communication with him in regard to magisterial appointments in County Down and I am glad to have this opportunity of acknowledging the great courtesy with which he has met my representations. I am bound, however, to say that when speeches of this kind are made I think it is the duty of the Lord Chancellor not to allow them to pass unchallenged, and that if the guilt of a particular magistrate is proved to his satisfaction it is his duty to remove that magistrate from the Bench, or signify in some way disapproval of his action. It is impossible for the House of Lords to attempt to govern Ireland. The Government of Ireland is in the hands of the Irish Office, and the Irish Executive alone must be responsible.

I agree with what was said by the Lord President of the Council as to the great excitability in the language of Irishmen. They frequently speak in the superlative sense, and often mean a great deal less than they say. But when persons in responsible positions make use of this language they ought to remember how their utterances will be construed. I do not regret that this question has been brought forward, though I admit that this language is less dangerous when Ireland is in a tranquil condition, as I am glad to think it is at present. I hope, however, that this debate will be read carefully by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and that he will carry out in the fullest sense the duty imposed upon him in this matter.

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I wish to say that I had no intention of reflecting at all upon the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. If I said anything which led to that impression I unhesitatingly withdraw it. It has been said that I have only taken four magistrates. I could have gone on quoting for a couple of hours, but I selected four specimens in order to save your Lordships' time. As to what was said by the noble Lord who represents the Irish Office, I can promise him that the next Question I put on the Paper will be very ample and that he will have no cause to complain on account of its indefiniteness. In the circumstances I ask leave to withdraw the Motion; but I should like to have an answer as to the disqualification for holding the position of *ex-officio* magistrate.

LORD ASHBOURNE: They are all stated in a section of the Irish Local Government Act.

Motion, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 12th July, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Tyrone (East Tyrone), in the room of Patrick Charles Doogan, esquire, deceased.—(*Captain Donelan.*)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill, Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Sutton District Water Bill, read the third time, and passed.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [Lords]; Wolstanton United Urban District Council Gas Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Charing Cross, West End, and City Electricity Supply Bill (by order); City of London Electric Lighting Bill (by order); West London Electric Undertakers' Association Bill (by order). Orders for Second Reading read and discharged; Bills withdrawn.

London Electric Supply Corporation Bill (by order); South Metropolitan Electric Light and Power Bill (by order). Orders for Second Reading read and discharged; Bills withdrawn.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill. Ordered, That in the case of the South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill, Standing Orders 84, 214, and 215 be suspended, and that the Bill be now taken into consideration.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill, as amended, considered accordingly:—

Ordered, That Standing Orders 223 and 243 be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

London Southern Tramways Bill. Order [6th March], that the Bill be committed, read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill. Order [10th July] for Second Reading upon Wednesday next, read, and discharged.

Bill referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill. Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered Tomorrow.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I).

Mr. TOULMIN reported from the Committee on Group I of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at a quarter before Twelve of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Amendments to—London and North Western Railway Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Kesteven, etc.) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time Tomorrow.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Devon, etc.) Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time Tomorrow.

Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]; County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill [Lords]; Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]; Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]; Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [Lords]; Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

Portsmouth Water Bill [Lords]. Reported with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; From Edensor; Horsley; Lillingstone Lovell; Little Hadham; and, Nottingham; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petitions against alteration of Law; From Broughton; Halifax; and, Tickenhall; to lie upon the Table.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION.

Petition from Bucklow, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION &c. (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; From Cadder; and, Glasgow; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION &c. (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; From Leith; and, Stirling; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petitions for alteration; From Guildford (two); Kirkdale; and, South Nottingham; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNTENANTED LANDS (IRELAND).

Return [presented 3rd July] to be printed. [No. 250.]

PRISONS (ENGLAND AND WALES).

Paper [presented 11th July] to be printed. [No. 251.]

IRISH FISHING-BOAT BUILDING.

Return [presented 11th July] to be printed. [No. 252.]

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Regulations for Technical Schools, Schools of Art, and other Schools and Classes for further Education (from 1st August 1906 to 31st July 1907) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TAXES AND IMPOSTS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 17th May; *Mr. Goddard*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 253.]

HOUSE OF COMMONS (VENTILATION).

Copy presented, of Appendix to Report of the Committee appointed to investigate and advise the First Commissioner of Works with regard to the improvement of the Ventilation of the House of Commons [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Crown Office Rules, Copy of Crown Office Rules, 1906 [by Act].

LOCAL GOVERNMENT INSPECTORS (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "of all the Inspectors now in the service of the Local Government Board, showing in respect of each, (1) his name; (2) date of original appointment; (3) age on appointment; (4) whether he obtained the appointment by competitive examination, or by nomination and examination; (5) if nomination, name of nominator; (6) occupation previous to appointment; (7) experience of local government previous to appointment; (8) present salary; (9) travelling and other expenses in last financial year; (10) amount of pension, if any, to which in normal course he will become entitled." (*Mr. Ginnell.*)

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "setting forth the name, age, length of service, and official position, of all salaried Officials in the various Government Departments in Ireland, who have been appointed (a) by nomination without examination; (b) by nomination with limited competition; (c) by nomination with qualifying examination." (*Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Naval Shipbuilding.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state the number of battleships and cruisers, respectively, of over 5,000 tons, under construction for the Royal Navy in the Royal Dockyards and private yards, respectively, on the 1st April 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Number of battleships and cruisers, respectively, of over 5,000 tons, under construction for the Royal Navy in the Royal Dockyards and private yards, respectively, on the 1st April 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906:—

Years.	Battleships.		Cruisers.	
	Dockyards.	Contractors.	Dockyards.	Contractors.
	Number.	Number.	Number.	Number.
1900 - - - -	8	7	4	12
1901 - - - -	10	6	8	15
1902 - - - -	7	5	9	13
1903 - - - -	6	6	8	14
1904 - - - -	7	5	7	8
1905 - - - -	4	4	7	9
1906 - - - -	4	2	4	7

Income Tax Arrears.

MR. SEARS (Cheltenham): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the clearing up of arrears of income-tax by officers of Inland Revenue is confined to those districts in which the collection of income tax is undertaken by the Department, or whether surveyors of taxes have also to deal with schedules of persons in default from whom payment has been demanded by parochial collectors; and whether they are enjoined by their instructions to request payment from persons named by the parochial collector as in arrear; and, if not, when the instruction was cancelled.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) When the duties have not been collected within the prescribed time the instructions of the collector require him to report such persons as are in arrear to the surveyor, who is then required to issue notices to the defaulters in a prescribed form demanding that payment should be made to the collector. Surveyors are not enjoined by their instructions to request payment from persons named by the parochial collector as in arrear, nor is payment to a surveyor permitted.

Income Tax Assessments.

MR. SEARS: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will obtain from each surveyor of taxes an estimate of the percentage of assessments for the past five years which have had to be corrected before and also after issue of notice to pay; and will he furnish the result of such information in tabular form.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) No. Any such estimate would be valueless unless based on a close examination of the records of assessments, and any such examination would occupy the time of the surveyors for several weeks, to the serious detriment of the work of the current year, without serving any purpose of public utility commensurate with the labour involved.

Income Tax Collection.

MR. SEARS: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will give a list of the places in which the collection of schedules D and E income-tax has been transferred from parochial collectors to collectors of inland revenue, the date of transfer in each case, and the saving effected in poundage previously paid to parochial collectors; will he state what success has attended the change; and why it has not been extended so as to embrace the whole of England and Wales.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The Inland Revenue Department's own officers collect the duty on all assessments made by the special Commissioners, and the whole of the income-tax under schedules D and E in many of the large towns where the appointment of collectors of taxes has devolved upon the Department, including Birmingham, Liverpool, Manchester, Bradford, Bristol, Bolton, Derby, Hull, Leeds, Leicester, Nottingham, Newcastle, Oldham, Warrington, Wolverhampton, Cardiff, Portsmouth, Sheffield, Southampton, and Sunderland. It would mean a considerable expenditure of time to verify the exact dates from which the several arrangements run, and the exact financial effect of each. The arrangement for collection of schedules D and E works well in the larger provincial centres, but would not be suitable for general adoption.

Australian Mail Contract.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he can state the conditions of the tenders which have been invited for the Australian mail contract when the present contract ceases; and whether the present system of two contracts, one by the Australian Government and one by the British Government, is to continue.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The tender forms and conditions of service have already been published; and I shall be happy to supply the hon. Member with copies of them. The Imperial Government proposes to continue the present system under which it provides a fortnightly mail service to and from Australia, leaving it to the Commonwealth Government to make its own arrangements for the intervening weeks.

Loughrea Police.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state how many policemen are at present quartered in the town hall, Loughrea; is he aware that the building, which preceded the present town hall, known as the Loughrea Linen Hall, was the property of the people of the town and used by them as a market house, and demolished by the father of the present Lord Clanricarde, on a pledge to build a capacious hall for the benefit of his tenants in the town and district; is he aware that, though the building has been in existence for over thirty years, the present Lord Clanricarde refuses to allow either the Town Commissioners or the townspeople to have any connection with the town hall; and having regard to the fact that the town hall at the present time is being used as a place of shelter for the police and at times hired out by the agent for itinerant shows, while the Town Commissioners require it urgently in the interest of the townspeople, whether he will add a new clause to the Town Tenants Bill, enabling the Town Commissioners of Loughrea to come into possession of their own town hall, either as a yearly tenant or purchaser.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the police authorities that sixty policemen are at present quartered in the building known as the town hall, at Loughrea. This building appears to be the property of Lord Clanricarde, but I have no information whatever as to the circumstances under which it was erected. The meetings of the town commissioners and of their successors, the urban district council, have, I am informed, been held elsewhere than in the town hall for many years past. The hon. Member's suggestion that the Government should introduce into a Bill, and indeed, a private Member's Bill, altering the general law, such a clause as is suggested, dealing with a particular building, does not appear to be practicable.

Dublin Corporation and the Irish Language.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Corporation of Dublin have passed a resolution deciding to place the name of the corporation in Irish only on all the rolling stock belonging to the council; and what steps he proposes to take to compel compliance with the law.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) No official information on this subject has reached me, and it would be altogether premature now to consider any course that may be taken in the future.

Untenanted Lands in Westmeath.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that there are in Westmeath more than 60,000 acres of untenanted land; and whether, in view of the need for its distribution, the number of persons who must emigrate if not provided with land, and the danger of the land being permanently disposed of otherwise under the Act which contemplated its distribution, he will ask the Estates Commissioners to institute an inexpensive preliminary inquiry as to whether this land would be sold to them voluntarily; and, if so, at what price.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I understand that there are some 80,000 acres of untenanted land in county Westmeath. I would willingly call the attention of the Estates Commissioners to the position of the county, but I believe them to be already possessed of the facts and of the need for action. I have already stated that the Commissioners intend to inquire from the owners of all untenanted land, which may be suitable for distribution, whether they are prepared to sell. The Commission to be appointed to deal with congestion will also take the condition of the untenanted land in the county into their consideration.

Deficiency of Officers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War what is the present deficiency, if any, of officers in the Royal Engineers, the Royal Artillery, the Household Cavalry, the Cavalry of the Line, the Brigade of Guards, the Infantry of the Line, the Militia Artillery, the Infantry Militia, the Imperial Yeomanry, and the Volunteer Force.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The present deficiency of officers is as follows:—

Royal Engineers - - -	11
Royal Artillery - - -	nil
Household Cavalry - - -	2
Cavalry of the Line - - -	42
Brigade of Guards - - -	12
Infantry of the Line - -	146
Militia Artillery - - -	144
Militia Infantry - - -	919
Imperial Yeomanry (combatant)	347
Volunteers (combatant) -	2,773

Vaccination.

MR. BRANCH (Middlesex, Enfield): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the effect upon the health of Alfred Handscombe (late an employee at the Small Arms Factory, Enfield), through vaccination being enforced upon him, he will consent to a similar modification of the rule as agreed to by educational authorities and as recommended to the magistrates by the Home Office.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The action taken by the Education Department in the case of teachers, and the case of Alfred Handscombe, do not appear to afford any sound grounds for an alteration of the decision not to admit men to the ordinance factories unless they consent to be vaccinated. I may point out that the Home Office letter is merely explanatory of the law in regard to vaccination generally.

Lothians Imperial Yeomanry.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the appointment of Lord Binning to the command of the Lothians and Berwickshire Imperial Yeomanry; whether Lord Binning has been a supernumerary to that regiment for a period of fifteen years in excess of that allowed by the Yeomanry regulations, and, being an officer of the Regular Forces on half-pay, is not eligible for the command of a Yeomanry regiment; and, if so, whether he will state why Lord Binning has been appointed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Lord Binning was appointed to this

Yeomanry regiment under the old regulations, which permitted the holding of a double commission, and was therefore eligible for the command. The appointment was made, following the usual practice on the recommendation of the General Officer commanding-in-chief in Scotland. His advice was given after close consideration of the whole of the circumstances.

Courts Martial.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will forbid any general court martial abroad during time of peace trying British soldiers for murder, and arrange that such cases shall be handed over to the civil authorities, as is the present custom in Great Britain.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The Army Act provides that a soldier shall not be tried by court martial for murder in any place within His Majesty's dominions outside the United Kingdom, other than Gibraltar, unless such person at the time he committed the offence was on active service, or such place is more than 100 miles from any city or town where he could be tried by a competent civil court. I am not prepared to issue any instructions affecting the provisions of the Act in this respect.

Executions of British Soldiers.

MR. LEA: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will issue an order to the Army that, in future, in time of peace, no British soldier condemned to death shall be executed in public, and that no soldiers shall be forced to witness such executions, thus making the Military authorities conform to the same practice as prevails with our civil authorities at home.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The points raised in the Question are now receiving careful consideration. Personally, I am in sympathy with the suggestion, but I must make careful inquiry, especially in India, before any conclusion can be come to on this grave matter.

Singapore Docks.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in the case of the Tanjong Pagar Dock Company, arbitration was resorted to at the suggestion of the Straits Government; whether any attempt was made to come to terms for a price, either before or after expropriation had been resolved upon, and, if so, with what result; did the company make any offer to the Government to dispose of their interests, and, if so, what were the terms of the offer; what have been the detailed costs of the arbitration, in fees to arbitrators and umpire and in other incidental expenses, respectively; who will pay the award and the costs of arbitration; will the Colonial Office furnish any correspondence or other papers in relation to these subjects; and is he aware that the award represents double the price of the shares at the time when notice of expropriation was given.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) It was the view of the late Secretary of State that the sum to be paid should be determined by mutual agreement, or, failing that, by arbitration. After notice of expropriation had been given, an offer was made by the Governor of $240 per share, being rather above the market quotation prior to the notice. The company asked for $700 and there appeared to be no prospect of reducing this wide difference by further negotiations. It will not be possible to state the cost of the arbitration until the accounts have been received and paid. The award and costs will be paid in the first instance by the Government of the Straits Settlements, and will be a charge on the undertaking acquired. The Secretary of State will consider the question of laying Papers on the subject. The award represents more than three times the price of the shares at the time stated in the last part of the Question.

Discharges from Barlinnie Gaol.

MR. WOOD (Glasgow, St. Rollox): To ask the Secretary for Scotland is he aware that the new method of discharging prisoners from Barlinnie prison on the termination of their sentences is causing considerable annoyance in certain districts of Glasgow; and if he will give instructions to discontinue the new practice.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) No representations on this subject, other than those made by the hon. Member, have reached me. I am communicating with the Prison Commissioners so that steps may be taken to arrange with the local authorities for the removal of any just cause of annoyance.

Foreign Postage Rates.

MR. H. BEAUMONT (Sussex, Eastbourne): To ask the Postmaster-General how the Post Office authorities justify the passing of 15-gram letters with their published regulations to the effect that the postage to be prepaid on letters for all foreign countries and for British Possessions not mentioned in the list appearing in the Post Office Guide is 2½d. per half-ounce.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The tolerance extended to letters exceeding half an ounce, but not exceeding 15 grammes, is not authorised by the published regulations, which are strictly in accordance with the statutory authority; but the concession is of long standing, and for that reason, as I have already announced in this House, I do not propose to withdraw it. When the new rates agreed upon by the Postal Congress at Rome come into force next year, the Question will disappear; for the one ounce, which will then come into force here as the unit of weight, will exceed the 20 grammes, which will be the unit of weight in countries having the metric system.

School Fire Drills.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether time occupied in fire drill may be counted in the minimum time required for a school attendance under the regulations for public elementary schools.

(*Answered by Mr. Lough.*) I think it is undesirable to lay down definite rulings of general application, irrespective of local circumstances, in matters of the kind referred to in the Question. I can imagine circumstances in which occasional practice in the rapid clearing of children out of a school building, with a little practice in the handling of fire apparatus by the elder boys, might be a very proper thing to sanction as part of the school programme, while it is equally clear that in many cases such an occupation would be absurd, and in most cases only to be sanctioned occasionally.

School Code.

MR. YOXALL: To ask the Secretary to the Board of Education whether under the terms of Article 38 (iv.), Code for Public Elementary Schools, it is intended that scholars in higher elementary schools shall be prepared for particular trades or generally for industrial life; and at what date the evening schools regulations will be in the hands of Members.

(*Answered by Mr. Lough.*) The hon. Member's Question as to the purpose of higher elementary schools is not one which can be answered properly in a sentence. It is important to have considerable latitude to suit differing circumstances. The Consultative Committee of the Board of Education have recently given special consideration to this Question, and I am hoping to issue in a few days, directly I receive it from the printers, a very valuable Report which they have compiled upon the problem in question. The evening school regulations will be in the hands of Members in two or three days.

Faulkner Estate, Queen's County.

MR. HAMMOND (Carlow): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have now concluded the purchase of the Faulkner estate, Springhill, Queen's County; if the purchase embraces the whole area of the estate in this county; if Mr. William Reilly's larger holding in Springhill is also included; and, if not, will he explain why.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have made an offer to the Land Judge for the purchase of the estate referred to, but they have not yet been informed whether or not their offer has been accepted. The offer embraces the whole estate in the county, with the exception of the holding of William Reilly, No. 16, Springfield. The superior landlord has rights of quarrying over the whole of this holding, and under the circumstances the Commissioners did not consider it desirable to include the holding in the estate.

Tenants' Improvements.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland is the test case about to be raised relating to the sale of a tenant's improvements to himself a zone case; and, if so, can he give the name of it, and say when it will be heard.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners have, in a case arising in Lord Kilmaine's estate, referred for decision to the Judicial Commissioner the question whether they are entitled to refuse to advance the full amount agreed upon, though secured on the land and buildings, on the ground that the agreed price is inequitable to the tenant purchaser, inasmuch as it includes the price of buildings belonging to him and not claimed by the landlord. The case in question does not come within the zones. The question has only now been referred to the Judge, and it is not yet known when it will appear in the Judge's list for argument.

Captain Sandes' Estate, Queen's County.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether agreements to purchase have been signed by the tenants on the estate of Captain Sandes, Garrymore, Mountmellick, Queen's County; can he say what provision has been made for the evicted tenants on the property; and will the Estates Commissioners see that the claims of the evicted tenants to purchase their old holdings are satisfactorily settled before sanctioning the sale.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners are unable to trace the lodgment of any purchase agreements in respect of the estate referred to. The claims of all evicted tenants will be duly inquired into and considered in the event of the estate being dealt with by the Commissioners.

Drumcoo Evicted Tenant.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Mrs. Ellen M'Guire, who is the only representative of her father who was evicted from his farm in the townland of Drumcoo, county Fermanagh, which he held under Captain Arthur H. M. Hamilton-Jones; will the applicant be restored; or what steps are being taken in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce*): The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have recently received from Mrs. M'Guire an application for reinstatement, and that they will have the case inquired into by an inspector in due course.

Irish Historical Manuscripts.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will undertake to see that the printing of the manuscripts relating to Ireland on which the Historical Manuscripts Commission and the English Record Office are now engaged is done in Dublin.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The printing of the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission and of the English Record Office is offered to tender in all parts of the United Kingdom. Recently the contract for certain of them, which relate mainly to English subjects, has been secured by a Dublin firm. It would hardly be to the advantage of Irish printers if the rule were established that the printing of such works must be executed in that part of the United Kingdom to which the subject matter relates.

Moynehall Evicted Tenant.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Frank Reilly, who was evicted by his landlord, Mr. John Fay, of Moynehall, Cavan, in 1886, from his farm in Coolkill; will he say whether this evicted farm is held by a grabber, and what steps, if any, are being taken to secure this evicted tenant's restoration to his old home.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners have received the application in question, and have referred it to one of their inspectors for inquiry. The holding is stated to be in the landlord's possession.

Mullycastle Evicted Tenant.

Mr. SAMUEL YOUNG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Mr. Michael M'Evoy, who was evicted from his farm in Mullycastle, county Cavan, on 2nd April, 1886, by Mr. John Fay, of Moynehall, Cavan, for non-payment of rent; is he aware that this evicted farm is on the landlord's hands; and will he say what steps have or are being taken in this case.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners have received from Michael M'Evoy an application for reinstatement in his former holding, which is stated to be in the landlord's hands. The case has been referred to an inspector for inquiry.

Upper Inny Drainage Board.

Mr. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if he will state who are the members of the Upper Inny Drainage Board, so far as relates to Westmeath; when and how have they been appointed; what are the constitution and powers of the Board; is the Board now operative; what are its liabilities in respect of outlay already incurred; what is the date of the latest official engineering report; when tenants suffer from their farms and bogs being flooded, and the landlords expecting to sell their estates refuse to take action, will the Board of Works have the necessary drainage carried out; and in cases of sale how will charges for the drainage be dealt with in relation to tenanted land and in relation to untenanted land.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I have ascertained from the Board of Works that information as to the names of the members of the Drainage Board, so far as relates to Westmeath, when and how they have been appointed, what are the liabilities of the Drainage Board in respect of outlay already incurred, and the date of the latest official engineering report, can only be obtained by referring to the Drainage Board. As regards the inquiry whether the Board of Works will have the necessary drainage carried out, the Board of Works inform me that they have no power to carry out drainage works. If a drainage board which has been constituted should neglect to maintain the works, the Board of Works may, on the representation of owners or occupiers in the district, who suffer from such neglect, intervene, and if they are unable to induce the Drainage Board to act, they may, with Treasury permission carry out maintenance works themselves at the cost of the ratepayers in the district. The manner in which charges will be dealt with in cases of sale depends on the circumstances of each case and the Statutes applicable to it. The Question does not admit of a summary Answer, but it may be stated in general that capital charges are redeemed out of the purchase money, and the annual maintenance charges are paid by the purchasers. The constitution and powers of the Drainage Board can be seen by reference to the Drainage Acts, 26 and 27 Vic., c. 88, and 31 and 32 Vic., c. 158. The Board is now operative.

Short Weight at Aldershot Canteen.

Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that packets of tobacco and groceries sold to soldiers at the canteen at Aldershot are frequently short in weight; and, seeing that any request for tobacco and groceries to be weighed in the presence of the purchaser is refused, will he cause inquiry to be made on the subject, with a view to remove all ground for complaint of short weight.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) No complaints of this nature have reached the War Office. The administration of canteens is a local matter. If my hon. friend can supply any specific instances of the matter to which he alludes, inquiries shall be made.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Naval Manœuvres.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state how many battleships were originally designated to take part in the recent naval manœuvres, how many were unable to take part in the manœuvres or parted company from other ships in this fleet owing to engine-room troubles or other causes; whether the numbers given include the "Montagu," which grounded at Lundy Island, the "Ramillies," which was rammed by the "Resolution," the "Goliath," "Canopus," "Ocean," and "New Zealand;" and whether any other battleships besides the "Victorious" were captured through accidents to their engine equipment.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): Until the umpires' reports have been received it is not considered desirable to furnish any information about the manœuvres.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can briefly inform the House what are the principal lessons as regards the defence of the United Kingdom, and the oversea food routes, to be deduced from the recent naval manœuvres. Has not the result of the manœuvres been to knock the "blue-water" school into a cocked hat?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Until the report of the umpires has been received no reply can be given to the Question.

Cruisers in the Levant.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many battleships and how many armoured cruisers were in the Levant in connection with the recent diplomatic difficulties with Turkey.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: There were five battleships and seven armoured cruisers in the Levant at the time referred to.

Wei-hai-Wei.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if any money already allocated by Parliament for Wei-hai-Wei still remains unexpended; and, if so, to what purpose such sum will be voted.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The aggregate amount included in the Navy Votes in respect to Wei-hai-Wei for the current financial year is £9,900, of which it may be assumed that rather more than one quarter has already been expended. This amount is spread over Votes 2, 3, 8, Sections 1, 2 and 3, 10 and 11.

Execution of an Indian Native.

MR. BRIGHT (Oldham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has received a Report from India of the circumstances connected with the execution of a native, who had appealed to the Governor-General; and what action he intends to take with respect to the official who is responsible for this execution.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): When this subject was first raised by a Question in the name of the hon. Member for Tyneside, I expressed my incredulity, and in some particulars incredulity was justified. Udoy Patny was sentenced to death by the Sessions Judge of Sylhet for murder. The right of appeal is of exceptional liberality in India. First, the capital sentence was confirmed by the High Court of Calcutta. Next, the prisoner had right of appeal to the High Court; whether he exercised this right I do not know. The date of the execution was fixed by the Sessions Judge for May 21st. The prisoner now appealed for mercy to the Lieutenant-Governor, who, in the exercise of the powers vested in him, declined on May 12th to interfere. The prisoner then made an oral statement to the superintendent of the gaol, appealing to the Government of India. The superintendent informed the Local Government of the fact by telegram on Sunday the 13th. On the 15th the record of the case and the notification of the appeal were despatched to the Government of India by registered letter marked "immediate." Owing to some error this letter which should have been delivered on the 19th, did not come into the hands of the Government of India until 10 o'clock on the morning of Monday, the 21st. The Government of India telegraphed staying the execution, if it had not been already carried out, not because they thought that the case deserved clemency—for the record satisfied them of the guilt of the accused—but because they were under the impression that a petition for mercy was on its way to them, and they did not realise that the telegram from the gaoler was all that the prisoner had to say. The convict had already been executed at 7 o'clock that morning. The Local Government admit in a communication to the Government of India that mistakes were made. They overlooked the fact that May 20th was a Sunday and therefore there might be delay. The superintendent of the Sylhet Gaol told them that he had fixed the 21st for the execution, but they gave him no orders to postpone. Let me say that if a prisoner, after petitioning the Local Government, further petitions the Government of India, and if such petition, in the opinion of the Local Government, contains nothing likely to influence the judgment of the Government of India in the prisoner's favour, the Local Government is bound, under the regulations of 1885 to forward it to the Government of India, but is not bound to postpone the execution beyond the date already fixed. In the present case the verbal petition to the Government of India added nothing to the petition to the Local Government which had already been rejected, and the Lieutenant-Governor's action was therefore strictly in accordance with the regulation to which I have just referred. Whatever may be the right construction of the rule, it was to be expected in my opinion that the Local Government, having forwarded the petition would make it part of the same operation to take care that the object in forwarding it should not be made futile by taking no steps to suspend the execution. I must remind the House that the Government of India have had no doubt upon a review of the record that the conviction and the sentence passed by the Sessions Judge and confirmed by the High Court of Calcutta were entirely just. There have been admitted faults in procedure, and I regret to say that in my view these proceedings fall short of the high and exact standard of official duty that the Indian Civil Service has for so many generations so notably maintained.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Does not all this point to the abandonment of the judicial policy of taking away human life?

[No Answer was returned.]

Indian Public Works Department.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will give the names of the colleges or other institutions at which the eleven candidates who were appointed last month, on the recommendation of the Selection Committee, to the permanent staff of the Indian Public Works Department, severally received their scientific or engineering education.

MR. MORLEY: Two had been educated at Trinity College, Dublin; one each at the following Universities:—Cambridge. London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Leeds, the Royal Irish University, the University of Wales; and one each at the Royal College of Science and the Central Technical College, Kensington.

Chinese Crime in South Africa.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the public interest will allow him to inform the House what military steps are being taken by the Government for the defence of the white community in South Africa.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The military aspects of the native disturbances in South Africa are receiving the careful attention both of the general officer commanding in South Africa and of the Secretary of State for War, and there is no statement which could usefully be made of the forces which would be mobilised to meet any of the various contingencies which require examination at the present time.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Has the regular garrison been increased?

MR. CHURCHILL: No increase has been made.

South African Tariff.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that the increase in the South African preferential tariff from two and a half to three per cent. was adopted in the Legislative Council of the Transvaal by a majority consisting solely of the official members, and against the unanimous vote of the elected members; has the Colonial Office any control over these official members; will it support the views and wishes of the people of the Transvaal, as represented by their elected members, and advise His Majesty to disallow the vote; can this increased tariff take effect without the concurrence of the Orange River Colony; if not, has that Colony given its assent, and in what form and by whose authority; and is the Colonial Office in any sense responsible.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The new Customs Convention must be ratified by the legislature of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony independently. The Secretary of State understands that it has been so ratified, but has received no detailed report of the proceedings. In view of the impending constitutional changes which will enable what has been done to be reconsidered by elected representatives, the Secretary of State as at present advised does not think it necessary to go further into the question.

Transvaal Imports.

Mr. ALDEN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will give a Return with figures showing the value of the present imports into the Transvaal, their increase since the war, the amount of Customs duty raised thereon, and the probable increase in the burden of taxation arising from the new tariff; and the estimated amount of the reduction of railway rates.

Mr. CHURCHILL: A Return of the character desired by the hon. Member will be laid before the House.

Convictions of Natives in the Transvaal.

Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state the number of convictions for crimes, outrages, and misdemeanours had against natives in the Transvaal from January 1st to July 1st, 1906; and will he define the character of the offences in the same way as has been done in regard to Chinese offences.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State will ask Lord Selborne to have such a Return prepared without delay.

Nigerian Railways.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any decision has been arrived at by the Government in regard to railway extension in Nigeria; and, if so, whether he is able to make any announcement on the subject.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The matter is receiving attention, but I am not yet in a position to make any announcement on the subject.

Kaffirs' Wages.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state what were the wages paid to Kaffirs in the mines of the Witwatersrand for the years 1898, 1901–2, 1902–3, 1903–4, and 1904–5, respectively.

Mr. CHURCHILL: According to the Report of the Government Mining Engineer the monthly average rate paid to natives in 1898 was 47s. 1d.; for the statistical year 1901–2 it was 26s. 8d.; for 1902–3, 38s. 6d.; for 1903–4, 48s. 10d.; for 1904–5, 52s.; for the last six months of 1905, 51s. 5d.

Indians in the Transvaal.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government of Her late Majesty protested on any occasion to the Government of the Transvaal Republic against the use of the word "native" to include Her Majesty's Indian subjects; and whether that protest was ever withdrawn?

Mr. CHURCHILL: His Majesty's Government in the negotiations which terminated in the arbitration at Bloemfonteim in 1895 refused to admit that the word "native" in the London Convention covered Indians. In view, however, of the circumstances of the case, they agreed to legislation by the South African Republic in derogation of the strict interpretation of the Convention.

Chinese Coolie Contracts.

Mr. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether in view of the recent outbreaks of crime among Chinese coolies in South Africa, and with the object of stopping their further importation, the Government will, in consideration of the cancellation of any existing contracts, offer to any person shown to be a loser thereby a sum of money not exceeding the loss actually sustained.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have nothing to add to the statements of policy already made to the House, which, as my hon. friend cannot fail to recognise, exclude the possibility of adopting his suggestion.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Is the Government going to maintain much longer the condition of Chinese slavery in the Transvaal?

[No Answer was returned.]

Recruitment of Kaffir Labour.

Mr. VERNEY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether with a view of substituting as far as possible Kaffir for Chinese labour in South Africa, the Government will immediately take all means available for the recruiting of Kaffirs by responsible persons and agencies?

Mr. CHURCHILL: As I have already explained to the House in answer to Questions of a similar character, His Majesty's Government are inclined to assist all legitimate means of recruiting natives, subject to the essential condition that the interests and good treatment of the natives themselves are effectually secured.

Coolie Import Licenses.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a record has been kept of the names of the firms or persons to whom the 16,000 licenses were issued in November last for the importation of Chinese coolies into the Transvaal; and, if so, whether he has any objection to state for whom the last two shiploads of coolies were brought to the Rand, and for whom the remaining 8,000 licences were issued.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The information is not in possession of the Colonial Office, but I will ask for it.

Mr. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any action has been taken by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to prevent further importations of Chinese labourers into South Africa; and whether a date has been fixed for cancelling the licenses remaining unused which were granted by the late Cabinet during their last week's term of office.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I would remind the hon. Member of the action taken by the Secretary of State, in fixing a time-limit for the further importations, as stated by me in this House on the 5th instant.†

The Disturbances in Natal.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the total destruction of native life, and the number of kraals destroyed by military operations in Natal, since the recent outbreak of hostilities.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I cannot add anything to my reply to a similar Question of July 5th.‡ Papers containing the information in the possession of the Colonial Office will be laid shortly. Meanwhile the Secretary of State has received the following telegram from Sir H. McCallum which the House may wish to hear. "July 11th. McKenzie's severe blows have had excellent effect; resistance practically over; rebels for the most part cowed and in hiding. Encouragement being given to surrenders and to wounded coming in for medical attendance. General proclamation is to be issued reassuring natives, and pointing out folly of armed rebellion. Barker has cleared Noodsberg, capturing thirty-three rebels and many cattle. General situation much clearer than for some time past."

Transvaal Gaol Population.

Mr. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the number of white men, Kaffirs, and Chinese, respectively, confined in the gaols of the Transvaal on May 31st last; and what proportion the number of prisoners bore in each case to the total number of the white men, Kaffirs, and Chinese then residing in the Colony.

---

† See Col. 211, 212.

‡ See Col. 214.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have not the figures for Kaffirs and white men, but I will make inquiry by mail as to the numbers and proportion.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official information showing that on Saturday night last a house on the Rand district of the Transvaal, occupied by a white man with his wife and children, was attacked by Chinese and Kaffirs; that the inmates were robbed; that the woman was outraged, dragged across the veldt, and again outraged; and, if so, can he say whether any of the perpetrators of these alleged crimes have been arrested.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir, but I will make inquiry.

MR. MACKARNESS asked whether, in view of the serious increase in the number of outrages, the Government intended to do anything for the protection of the white population.

MR. CHURCHILL asked for notice of the Question.

Alleged Chinese School at Johannesburg.

MR. J. WARD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the attention of his Department has been called to a recent police court case at Johannesburg wherein certain persons were charged with keeping an alleged school for Chinamen at Teiffenberg's Buildings; whether the evidence of Sergeant Adams has been cabled home; and what was the result of the judicial inquiry.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir. If the hon. Member will furnish me with the information on which he bases his Question, inquiry shall be made.

Abyssinia.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any preliminary agreement between France and Great Britain as to the Abyssinian Railway has been reached; and, if so, whether the consent of the Emperor of Ethiopia has been obtained, or is expected.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in a position to state the nature of the undertakings given on behalf of this country in the agreement between Great Britain, France, and Italy concerning Abyssinia; and what advantages to British commerce he has endeavoured to obtain from this agreement.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): An agreement between Great Britain, France, and Italy has now been provisionally initialled. Steps have been taken to communicate it to the Emperor Menelek, and it will not be signed or published till His Majesty has expressed his views.

Prosecutions of Europeans in Egypt.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will say upon what evidence the assertion of unusual political unrest in Egypt at the present time is based; and whether he will furnish a Return showing the number of prosecutions and convictions for offences of violence against members of the Army of Occupation and European civilians, respectively, together with nationalities and localities during the last five years, including as far as possible the present year.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I cannot undertake to have such a Return prepared. The statements I have made are based upon confidential reports received from His Majesty's representative at Cairo extending over several months.

The Denshawi Trial.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will state under what section of the Native Penal Code or the Special Decree of 1895 the sentence of flogging was passed in the Denshawi cases.

SIR EDWARD GREY: By Article 5 of the Decree of 1895 the Special Tribunal has full power to inflict whatever punishment is considered necessary, without reference to the ordinary penal code. A translation of the Decree including this Article will be included in the Papers which have been promised.

MR. MACVEAGH: Does the Decree give power to inflict the punishment of flogging?

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Tribunal is given full discretion in the matter of punishment without regard to the code.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): Have the Special Tribunal power to inflict any punishment they please; torture, for instance?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I will lay the translation of the Decree on the table and the House will see what its wording actual is. If it is their desire to discuss the terms of the Decree, any question in regard to it can be raised afterwards.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the request for trial by the Special Tribunal under the Decree of 1895 has to be made by Lord Cromer and the General Office Commanding the Army of Occupation jointly, and, if so, was this done in the recent case at Denshawi; whether, seeing that the officers in question had obtained no authoritative permission to shoot pigeons at Denshawi, they were committing an illegal act and liable as trespassers; and whether, as, even if permission had been granted, they were acting solely as private individuals, and not in the exercise of their regular functions, he will explain why the Decree of 1895 was applied.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Lord Cromer, on receipt of an application from the General Officer Commanding, requested the Ministry for Foreign Affairs to summon the Special Tribunal provided for by the Decree ot 1895. It has not been suggested that the officers were guilty of trespass. The Special Tribunal was instituted to take the place of courts-martial; to insure that cases of this nature should be tried by competent judges acquainted with the country, customs, and language of the people; and, at the same time, to prevent any possible miscarriage of justice, by giving greater security to the accused than they would have had if tried by courts-martial.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in a previous case, in which the officers or soldiers were not acting in their military capacity, it was held that the Decree did not apply?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not aware that any case of that kind has arisen.

MR. MACVEAGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether these officers were acting as private individuals?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have said they were in uniform. The officers of an Army of Occupation in uniform cannot be considered as private individuals.

MR. MACVEAGH: Were they committing an illegal act in uniform?

SIR EDWARD GREY: No, sir; they were not committing an illegal act.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the President of the Special Tribunal, Boutros Pacha Ghali, had ever qualified in law and had ever sat as a judge in a criminal case before; if so, when and where; whether at the trial the questions were put by the members of the Court to the witnesses, instead of by counsel; and whether this is in accordance with the native code of criminal procedure.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Boutros Pacha was for many years Under-Secretary of State at the Ministry of Justice. I am not aware whether he has previously officiated as a judge in a criminal case, but he is Acting Minister of Justice in the absence of the latter, and as such necessarily presided over the Court. At the trial, after each witness had been heard, counsel for the defence were invited by the Court to put any questions they pleased. This is in accordance with the code of criminal procedure in Egypt.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when he hopes to be able to lay before the House official papers concerning the recent trials and executions at Denshawi, Egypt.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As soon as possible, and at any rate before the end of the session. I hope in a fortnight.

MR. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether all the proceedings of the special tribunal under the Decree of 1895 are required to be taken in accordance with the Egyptian penal code; whether, in accordance with the provisions of such code, the prisoners at the preliminary investigation at Denshawi were confronted with the witnesses for the prosecution; whether the preliminary examination was conducted by an examining magistrate; whether the Parquet was represented thereat, and the evidence taken in the presence of the prisoners; whether the prisoners were represented by counsel who were afforded opportunities of examining directly the witnesses for the prosecution, or how otherwise; whether the body of Captain Bull, the injuries occasioned to his fellow officers, and those received by the woman shot and other villagers were examined by medical men other than those who gave evidence for the prosecution; if so, who carried out the examination on behalf of the prisoners; whether, seeing that the Egyptian code of criminal procedure requires that the prosecution in all criminal trials shall be represented by a member of the Parquet, he will say why this course was departed from in this instance; and whether he will explain why the native advocate, Ibrahim Bey Helbowi, was appointed to prosecute in this case, in view of the general practice and the interests of the accused.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Article 4 of the Decree of 1895 lays down that the Tribunal shall follow the rules of procedure as provided for by the native criminal code, in so far as they are compatible with the necessity of expediting the proceedings. I am not aware of the reasons for appointing Helbowi Bey to conduct the prosecution. I have no information as to the other points, which will doubtless appear in the account of the evidence given at the trial.

Death Duties.

MR. SEARS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer seeing there is no outdoor staff charged specially with preventing the evasion of death duties, if he will say how queries relating to affidavits sent from the head offices are dealt with; whether they are referred to the solicitors who prepared the account, or to the executor or administrator of the estate; if not, to whom are they referred.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): By Section 7 (8) of the Finance Act, 1894, "the value of any property for the purpose of estate duty shall be ascertained by the Commissioners in such manner and by such means as they think fit." Queries issued in pursuance of these powers are addressed to those persons who, according to the circumstances, may seem to be the best qualified to answer them.

Factory Inspectors.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been directed to the statement in the Factory Inspectors' Report, just issued, that Mr. J. H. Warren and Mr. T. O. Edwards, factory inspectors, each travelled nearly 16,000 miles in 1905, or about sixty miles for each working day, while many other inspectors travelled distances almost as great; and, if so, whether he will make such an increase in the staff as will enable the inspectors to devote more time to inspection and less to travel.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I have had the Report to which my hon. friend refers before me. In parts of the country which are not industrial in character and where factories and workshops are comparatively few and scattered, it is not possible to avoid a large amount of travelling on the part of the inspectors. I am, however, quite in agreement with my hon. friend in thinking that time spent in travelling should be reduced to a minimum. Certain changes in this direction have recently been made, and further readjustment will follow the increase in the staff which I am about to propose.

Leckhampton Right of Way Dispute.

MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has received any petition or petitions praying for the complete or partial remission of the sentences passed by Mr. Justice Lawrence at the recent Gloucester assizes upon Barrett and others for rioting on Good Friday last at Leckhampton Hill, Cheltenham; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. SEARS: I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the Leckhampton Hill case, which arose out of a demonstration in defence of public rights; is he aware that Mr. Barrett, among others, was sentenced to four months hard labour, although police and other witnesses testified to his character and respectability, and to the fact that the general tone of his speech was to persuade the people not to do damage; that he took no part in and was not present at the riot; is he aware that Barrett's speech, urging the people not to do damage, was construed to be an incitement to riot; and will he investigate the case and reconsider the sentences passed by the judge on Barrett and the other prisoners.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I have received no petition in this case, though my attention has been drawn to it informally by the hon. Member for Cheltenham, but the newspaper report with which he has kindly furnished me is the only information I as yet possess. I can only say that if I receive any petition shewing grounds for believing either that any of the convictions are wrong, or that the sentences are unnecessarily severe, it will be my duty carefully to consider all the reasons alleged, and to consult the judge, and make any inquiries that may be necessary before deciding what advice I should tender to the King.

Quack Medicines.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention had been called to the remarks made by Mr. Coroner Troutbeck, at an inquest held at Wandsworth on the 9th instant, to the effect that the deceased was in a state of health to fall an easy prey to quackery, and that quacks were allowed to practice and make fortunes out of poor people who were suffering from mortal diseases; and will he say whether he intends to take any steps to prevent the public from being victimised by such persons.

*MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir. My attention had not been called to the Coroner's remarks. I fear I cannot add anything to the reply on this subject which I gave to the Question asked by the hon. Member on March 12th last.†

MR. MYER: When will the right hon. Gentleman be aroused to a sense of his duty.

[No Answer was returned.]

German Gipsies at Hull.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the condition of the bands of gipsies now at Hull; whether he has received information that such bands will not be allowed either to go on to the United States or to return to Germany, whence they are said to have come; and whether, if the instructions under the Aliens Act are not sufficiently stringent to keep out such immigrants, he will consider the question of revising them.

*MR. GLADSTONE: The German gipsies now at Hull form part of those who landed in Scotland in March, April, and May. When it became apparent that the traffic was being organised so that these aliens should escape inspection I took steps, as announced to this House on May 10th,‡ to secure that any further arrivals by the steamship line which was carrying them should be subjected to inspection. Those steps were successful in preventing any further arrivals. I think the American law would certainly prevent these gipsies from landing in the United States. As regards Germany, I understand that the main difficulty is due to the lack of passage money. The Aliens Act gives me no power in the matter except as regards any individuals who may be brought before a Court in circumstances rendering them liable to expulsion under the Act.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 921.

‡ (See (4) *Debates*, clvi., 1482, 1483.

Case of Miss Chesshire.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will refer the case of the apprehension and detention of Miss Alice Louisa Chesshire, on December 14th, 1905, as a suspected lunatic, to the Metropolitan Police Commission of Inquiry now sitting to investigate and report upon.

*MR. GLADSTONE: The police in the execution of their duty apprehended this lady who was found by them wandering in the streets unable to give any account of herself. She was subsequently certified to be insane and removed to Cane Hill Asylum. The case does not appear to come within the scope of the inquiry by the Royal Commission.

DR. COOPER: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to the case of Miss Alice Louisa Chesshire, who, on the night of December 14th, 1905, was taken by the police to the St. Giles' Workhouse as a suspected lunatic, and on admission was searched by the workhouse porter; and whether he will consider the advisability of issuing an instructional order to boards of guardians requiring that in all cases where it is necessary that women should be searched it shall be done by a woman and not by a man.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I have made inquiry on this subject, and am informed that upon the admission of the patient to the workhouse her pockets were searched by the matron of the Tottenham Court Road Police Station, by whom she was accompanied, and that she was taken at once to the Female Lunatic Ward. I am further informed that in no instance has the workhouse porter searched a female lunatic or other female on admission. It devolves on the matron of the workhouse to cause females to be searched on admission, and I understand that at the St. Giles' Workhouse this duty is performed by a female officer under the matron's supervision.

Vaccination Fees.

MR. J. JOHNSON (Gateshead): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he has taken any steps in the direction of reducing the high fees paid for vaccination; if so, what steps; and, if nothing definite has been done, will he say when the grievance complained of by the local authorities is likely to be redressed.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have not at present definitely decided what shall be done in this matter. I am, however, giving attention to it, and I will come to a decision on the subject as early as may be practicable.

Motor Car Speeds.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state how many applications from local authorities to limit the speed of motor cars within certain limits and at certain places under the Motor Car Act, 1903, Clause 9, he has received since taking office, and how many he has agreed to and how many he has refused.

MR. JOHN BURNS: Two such applications have been received. With regard to one of them a local inquiry is about to be held, and with regard to the other I am awaiting some further particulars for which I have asked. I may add that there were three cases of the kind referred to in which the application had been received before the change of Government took place, but which were not ready for decision at that time. In each of these cases I have decided to issue a restricting order with respect to the more important of the roads to which the application relates.

Australian Mail Contract.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is able to communicate to the House the terms of the new mail contract with Australia; and whether the arrangement comprises an all-British service.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): No new contract has yet been concluded by His Majesty's Government for the fortnightly mail services which it provides to and from Australia. A service is provided in the alternate weeks by the Australian Government; but I have no information as to any arrangements which that Government may have made for carrying on the service after the termination in January, 1908, of its existing contract with the Orient Steam Navigation Company.

St. John's School, Wakefield.

MR. SNOWDEN (Blackburn): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he is aware that the children are being sent home from St. John's School, Wakefield, because the parents refuse to pay school fees; and that where parents insist upon free places the local education committee compel children to attend a school nearly a mile away from their homes; and whether the managers of St. John's School, which is rate-aided and State-supported, can refuse free places or charge fees; and, if so, will he consider an Amendment to the Education Bill making all places in a primary school under the local authority free.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): The Board of Education have no information of the incident referred to in the Question, and I am not aware of any complaint in regard to school fees in Wakefield. No fees may be charged in a public elementary school unless sanctioned by the local authority; and in other ways the conditions in regard to the charge of fees are very strict. It is the duty of the local authority to provide a sufficient number of places in public elementary schools without charge of fee, for the needs of the area; and no parent can be called upon to pay a fee for his child in a public elementary school if there is no room for him in any other school within reach without payment of fee. If any Wakefield parent appeals to the Board of Education I will see that the case is carefully investigated.

Dog Licence Exemptions.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he is aware that the words in the Dogs Bill, requiring that the consent of the Petty Sessions Court in England and the Sheriff in Scotland must be obtained before a certificate will be given to persons such as farmers, crofters, and shepherds, who have long enjoyed exemption on the ground that dogs were a necessity of their lives, will affect such persons prejudicially; and whether he will introduce Amendments to continue the exemption these persons have hitherto enjoyed.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): In pursuance of Section 22 of the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1878, a certificate of exemption from licence duty can be obtained by farmers or shepherds for dogs kept and used solely for the purpose of tending sheep or cattle on a farm or in the exercise of the calling or occupation of a shepherd. This enactment will still remain in force. It is not proposed to alter in any way the grounds on which exemption is granted, but only to provide a more efficient and convenient means of deciding doubtful cases No personal appearance before the Court will be necessary except in opposed cases, and then only if the Court considers such appearance to be necessary for the proper consideration of the application.

Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if his attention has been directed to the fact that the cost of upkeep of the Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew, added to the rental value of the area which they cover, amounts to a very large sum of money; and whether he will consider the advisability of making that expenditure of more value to the taxpayers by adding to the staff the few men necessary to enable the gardens to be opened on Sunday mornings without adding to the hours of Sunday labour.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: My noble friend has given further consideration to the representations made by my hon. friend on this subject, but he regrets that he does not see his way to modify the conclusion at which he previously arrived. I may add that the additional expenditure entailed by the earlier opening of the gardens as proposed would not be less than £600 a year.

Deptford Cattle Market.

DR. COOPER: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that, owing to the closing of the Deptford Foreign Cattle Market to the cattle and sheep of all countries, except those from the United States and Canada, a large number of tanners, fellmongers, slaughtermen, drovers, carmen, and clerks, earning wages of upwards of £4,000 per week, have been put out of work; and whether the Board of Agriculture will relax the present prohibitory regulation and allow cattle and sheep to be imported for immediate slaughter from all countries which have been officially declared to be free of foot-and-mouth disease for twelve months.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I have no means of saying whether or not the estimate in the first part of my hon. friend's Question is correct, but I may point out that the effect of the prohibition of the landing at Deptford of animals brought from the Continent has been more than counterbalanced by the increase which has taken place in the North American trade since the year 1892, when the prohibition came into force. For the reasons indicated in the reply which I gave to my hon. friend on the 2nd instant, † it is not possible for the Board, consistently with their statutory obligations, to adopt the course he suggests.

North Tadworth Farm, Epsom.

MR. ALDEN: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if his attention has been directed to the fact that on February 16th last Mr. William Hodson and his family were evicted from North Tadworth Farm, Epsom, after a tenancy of twenty-eight years, during which he had established a fruit-growing and jam-making industry, employing many people, as the sequel to litigation concerning his right to protect his plantations by shooting rabbits under a special clause in his lease; and whether he can promise legislation, either by affording time for the Land Tenure Bill or otherwise, in order to prevent farmers being deprived of their livelihood in the interests of sport.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The circumstances to which my hon. friend refers were brought personally to the notice of my noble friend by Mr. Hodson himself, but I understand that they are likely to form the subject of further legal proceedings, and I cannot therefore express any opinion respecting them. The representations made by Mr. Hodson will be borne in mind when the Land Tenure Bill again comes forward for consideration.

Ecclesiastical Commission Estate in Durham.

MR. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the hon. Member for East Bristol, as Church Estates Commissioner, the number of licences owned by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in the county of Durham.

*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): The number, so far as is known, is 69.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): Is the number greater this year than last?

*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: That is a Question difficult to answer. Leases are continually falling in.

MR. LEIF JONES: Is it the policy of the Commissioners to reduce the number of licences on their property?

*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Yes, that has always been their policy.

Liskeard Training Schools.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, in view of the fact that practically no advantage has been taken of the offer made by the Congested Districts Board to assist boys at the training school for the mercantile marine at Liskeard, he will approach the Admiralty with the object of obtaining for the Highlands and Islands one of the obsolete cruisers about to be sold as a training ship for the mercantile marine.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1380.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): There are no funds available for the maintenance of a vessel engaged in the purpose contemplated by the hon. Member, and expenditure on this object is also outside the powers of the Congested Districts Board. It would not therefore serve any useful purpose to approach the Admiralty.

Uneconomic Holdings in Ireland.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland will the inquiry for which a Royal Commission is to be appointed be an inquiry into uneconomic agricultural holdings whether isolated or not, or will it be restricted to congestion, as defined by existing statutes; and will it be also an inquiry into untenanted land as the material from which the present uneconomic condition of Ireland has to be relieved.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND: (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): The inquiry will relate to congestion generally, and will not be limited to the districts now scheduled under the Act as congested. It will include the question of obtaining untenanted land as a means of relieving congestion and creating economic holdings.

Estates Commissioners' Regulations.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will give the name of the author of those portions of the regulations issued to the Estates Commissioners under the late Government which those Commissioners afterwards declared to have been invalid, unreasonable, vague, and subversive of the law; is the author of these regulations still in the service of the present Government in the same department, without any diminution of salary or restriction of power; and, if so, what is his salary, and why is he retained.

MR. BRYCE: The regulations in question were issued by the late Government, and I do not know who was particularly responsible for suggesting any part of them. Even if I did know, it would be entirely against the rules of the public service to attribute responsibility to any persons other than the Minister of the Crown.

MR. GINNELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman in a position to deny that Sir Antony Macdonnell is the author?

MR. BRYCE: I do deny it.

Drumraney Outrage.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received particulars of an attack upon the farmhouse of John Cassells, at Drumraney, Westmeath, by men with firearms, when many shots were fired into the dwelling, and the farmer's two sons had a narrow escape of being killed; whether he has any information as to the cause of this attack; and whether the police have any clue to the perpetrators.

MR. BRYCE: It was reported to the police that on the night of June 26th one shot was fired through a window of Cassells' house, but from the direction in which the shot was fired it would not appear that personal injury was intended, and it is, I am informed, not the case that Cassells' sons had a narrow escape. Whether more than one person was concerned in the matter is not known, nor is the cause known. The police have not yet succeeded in bringing the offender to justice, but are pursuing their inquiries in the case.

Carroll v. Cryan.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the solicitor acting on behalf of Edward Carroll has stated that he replied to all the letters received from Constable Cryan or his solicitor; and, under the circumstances, whether he will see that Constable Cryan is not allowed to evade his legal liability and that he be called upon to pay his part of the damages obtained against him in the High Court for an assault upon Edward Carroll on March 17th, 1905.

MR. BRYCE: As I imformed the hon. Member on March 1st,† Constable Cryan wrote to the plaintiff's solicitor offering to pay his share, namely, £50, of the damages by instalments, but the offer was refused. Having regard to the constable's circumstances, the offer appears to the Inspector-General to be a reasonable one. The constable does not appear to be seeking to evade his legal liability.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clii., 1270.

Waterford Evicted Tenants.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Guiry, inspector of Estates Commissioners, met some evicted tenants of the estate of J. G. Beresford, near Stradbally, county Waterford, on the 2nd instant; that Mr Beresford has long since lodged an application with the Estates Commissioners for the sale of certain lands at or near Stradbally, under the Land Act of 1903, and asking to have them declared an estate; and that Mr. Beresford ordered the inspector to desist from inspecting portions of his estate consisting of evicted farms and untenanted land; and whether, in view of the necessity of facilities being given to the inspectors of the Estates Commissioners to inspect lands on estates which it is proposed to sell, he will say what steps the Estates Commissioners now propose to take in this case.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the applications of the evicted tenants on Mr. Beresford's estate were referred to an inspector for inquiry. His report, however, has not yet been received, and in the meantime the Commissioners have no information as to what happened at his inspection. Upon the receipt of the report the Commissioners will deal with the matter. It is the fact that purchase agreements in respect of portion of the estate have been lodged with the Commissioners, but in the ordinary course the case will not, in order of priority, be reached this year.

Dromod Police Hut.

MR. McKEAN (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any steps are being taken, or are about to be taken, towards the removal of the police hut at Dromod; whether he is aware that the sergeant in charge of the hut has a farm of land some miles away where he spends the greater part of his time, and that the police attached to the station have no duties to perform; and whether he will, under such circumstances, direct the hut to be removed at once.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the police authorities that the police hut in question, through originally provided as a protection post, has for the past ten years been used as a permanent police station with a district attached, and the police employed there perform all the ordinary duties appertaining to a police station. The continuance of this station is considered necessary, the two nearest stations being each five miles distant. The sergeant in charge of the station has a farm in the adjoining county, at which it is understood he spends his annual leave of absence, but the Inspector-General is not aware that he goes there at other times. Inquiry, however, will be made into the matter.

Cootehill Evicted Tenant.

MR. McKEAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the case of Andrew Beggan, an evicted tenant on the estate of Captain E. P. Smith, Bellamont Forest, Cootehill, county Cavan, which estate has been sold under the Land Act, 1903, the first instalment of the purchase money having been paid; whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any action for the purpose of having Beggan reinstated, and, if so, what those steps are, and whether they promise to be successful; and, if they have taken no steps in the matter, will he explain why they have not done so.

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that an originating application for the sale of Captain Smith's estate is before them, but they have not yet sanctioned the advances, and therefore none of the purchase money has been paid. It is stated in the Schedule of Tenancies that the landlord has offered to reinstate Andrew Beggan, but no purchase agreement has been lodged in his case. The Commissioners have directed their inspector to enquire into Beggan's case, but have not yet received his report.

Roo Estate, Gort.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware

Accounts Department, which will come in course of payment during the year ended on the 31st day of March, 1907."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): I think it will be for the convenience of the Committee that I should at once make a full statement. What I have to lay before the Committee is nothing else than the proposals of the Cabinet regarding the reorganisation of the forces of the King. This debate has been anticipated with a lively interest. It has given rise to a vast amount of ingenious and intelligent anticipation. These anticipations have not been confined to the Press. My two right hon. predecessors have exercised themselves upon the subject. I much regret personally that my right hon. friend, Mr. Brodrick, is not to-day present in the House for the purposes of this discussion. He has mobilised his forces against me. He has brought his artillery to bear upon my artillery. He has pronounced my scheme, although he had not yet come in sight of it, as in part a national calamity, and in part a national crime. I cannot discuss Mr. Brodrick's letter in his absence; but I will make this observation—it is not always a safe thing to use your artillery against an enemy whose position you have not yet ascertained. You are apt to disclose your own position and to use up your ammunition in vain. But Mr. Brodrick is not the only ex-Minister who has entered the lists. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon has been more cautious. But in his case, too, there have been symptoms of feverish activity which have urged him to rush into print, if not into war. Well, what I have to say may, perhaps, make a good many of the criticisms that have been made seem beside the point. But there are other things on which, I think, we are all agreed. One of them is this—I do not care in what part of the House he sits, but I believe there is hardly a Member who is not profoundly convinced that the state of our national forces is highly unsatisfactory. Whether you come to the matter from the point of view of cost, or from the point of view of organisation, there is much to be done, resolute effort to be made, before things can be brought to a satisfactory condition. The Government has both of these considerations to bear in mind—cost and efficiency. As it has been suggested that I, for one, have been driven into a desire to reduce the Army Estimates and to put a check on the extravagance which has been been growing up, I desire, most emphatically, to associate myself with the proposition of the necessity for check and reduction. It was the Duke of Wellington who used to say that no greater harm could be done to the British Army than to associate it in the public mind with extravagance. I am sure that that is not only true, but that it is the view of many of the most thoughtful soldiers to-day, who hold very strongly that before you can restore public confidence in the Army you must make the people feel that they are getting value for their money. Then there are other considerations bearing upon this question of the growth and cost and burden of armaments. I do not repeat the solemn warning which was given to the House recently by my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I do not repeat the equally solemn warning that was given by an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord St. Aldwyn, in another place not long ago, and corroborated by Lord Goschen. I think we all feel that with the income-tax at a shilling, and the public finances in the state in which they are, it is time, at least, that the situation should be closely and carefully surveyed. Then there is another consideration. The democracies of the world, however they may be divided on other points, are at one in making manifest at this moment their desire that the crushing burdens of armaments which press upon them should be lightened. We in this great, rich, and powerful country have the opportunity of taking our share in that movement. We mean to give the lead.

But it is not merely the point of view of economy that has rendered it necessary that the situation of the Army should be closely reviewed. It is essential also from the point of view of organisation and efficiency. Since I came to the War Office I have been struck with this—that while never before, perhaps, in the history of our country, have we had finer soldiers or better officers than those thoughtful new men who have matured since the trial of the great war in South Africa, still we suffer from the disorganisation and the want of intelligent principle in the arrangement of our forces, which put every attempt to make things better to naught. You have evidences of that at every turn. We have had many schemes of Army reorganisation in the past; but it has generally been the alternation of an Army without a scheme or a scheme without an Army; and the time seems to have come, in the opinion of soldiers and the public, for an attempt, a resolute attempt, to be made to turn schemes of Army reorganisation into realities.

Since I have been at the War Office I have been approached by many of the modern type of officers to whom I have referred, who have said to me—"No soldier but would like more money and more men. But we recognise that the nation demands retrenchment, and we know the grounds upon which it is held to be necessary. We do not dispute those grounds; we are prepared to agree with them. But this much we say to you—use the power, if you can obtain it from this new Parliament, full of vigour and ideas, to reorganise the Army in such a fashion that it shall be fit for the only purpose for which an army is needed—the purpose of war. We hate war. Would that the day had come when the curse of war might be averted from us, when it was no longer necessary to prepare forces for our defence. But till that day comes it is our duty to see that every penny spent on the Army is spent on fighting efficiency." That is the view of the Army. That is the view of the Army Council. That is the view of many soldiers of every shade of politics—some of them in this House—who have come to me and said—"Do not lose this great opportunity for asking Parliament to reorganise us—it may be in a drastic and searching fashion—but to reorganise us in such a way that we shall be fit for war."

That is the keynote of the attempt at Army reform of my colleagues and myself which I have to-day to lay before the House of Commons. Some time ago I made a speech in introducing the Army Estimates, in which I laid down certain principles, which I said were engaging my attention and the attention of my advisers and which seemed to be reasonable. We had a great deal of discussion on them, and some of them form the foundation of what I have to say to-day. I am not going to restate at length those principles or to repeat what I then said. I asked for time to consider them. The House has been generous to me. It has not pressed me to hurry over my difficult and delicate task. I have had time to think; and to-day I wish to use the period of the debate which I shall occupy for the purpose of stating the concrete proposals in which these principles have resulted as distinguished from the grounds on which those principles were based. I shall only summarise very shortly what I have already laid down. But before I do so let me make one observation.

I concur entirely in the view that we owe in approaching this task a great deal to the work that has been done. The Committee of Imperial Defence has, to my mind, been a most valuable institution in bringing out certain broad principles. The right hon. Gentleman opposite, the Leader of the Opposition, did the nation a service when he devised an instrument which should bring Admiralty policy and War Office policy into contact with the general policy of the Empire. It is largely due to the discussions which have taken place in that body, and to the light which has been obtained by surveying things not merely in isolation but as a whole that it is possible to get some coherent view, be it right or wrong, of the problem that lies in front of us. One other thing I wish to say. I have stated that while soldiers generally would naturally like more men and more money, the wisest of them see the necessity of a stern attempt at reduction. On that hypothesis, on the hypothesis that economy is necessary, on the hypothesis that those who insist on economy are ready to extend to them also the boon of reorganisation—reorganisation on the basis that war and war only is the thing for which an army ought to exist—I have been able, if I may so say, to enter into a covenant with the influential representatives of the Army. They have put their best strength into the propositions which I have to lay before the Committee, which propositions would have been of very little value if they had been my own propositions only, but are propositions which have been accepted and endorsed by the Cabinet after they have been worked out to the last point by the highest skilled experts who are at present responsible for the work of the General Staff, for the work of the Adjutant-General's Department, and for the work of the Quartermaster-General and the Ordnance

Departments of the War Office. I cannot express my obligations too deeply to my colleagues of the Army Council for assisting me in the way they have done to work out the scheme of reorganisation which I have to present, and—on the hypothesis that reductions are right—the whole-hearted concurrence they have expressed in a proposal which, just because it is their own, I believe will result in the increase of the efficiency for fighting purposes of the British Army by 50 per cent. I cannot but express my thanks to those young officers who have thrown their energies and their minds into this question. These proposals result in a large reduction of men and of money; and yet, by the reorganisation of the Army as a whole, the result is produced in a form in which, if we have had to pare down, we have also used our materials in building up and completing the structure so that at last it is homogeneous.

But economy and efficiency are not incompatible things. Look at the great industrial concerns, the railways and big manufacturing establishments—how are they made to pay their dividends? Why, by going through every item of their accounts, and asking why and for what reason has this money been spent, and what justification there is for every item. We have been living laborious days at the War Office during the last few months. I am afraid the eight hours movement shows no signs of reaching that great Department, and, more than that, we have put the Army lately on a very frugal and somewhat niggardly administration; but the result has been that we have been able to go through the Army piece by piece, and bit by bit, inquiring why that bit is there, whether it is sound, whether there is any excess, aye, and what is equally important, whether there is any deficiency. We have applied to the Army the same procedure that an accountant would apply in investigating the affairs of a business; we have gone through it bit by bit, and asked in what condition that bit is, and what justification there is for the money spent upon it. We have put as regards every officer and man, and every pound spent, the determining question:—What does that officer, that man, that money mean, tested by the standard of efficiency for war?

When I last spoke in this House, on March 8th last,† I laid down certain broad principles. The first question which I then discussed and to which I sought to find an answer was what was the purpose for which the British Army exists; and the answer was a very simple one. It was for war overseas. No doubt you have to provide for home defence, but the primary task which rests on the British Army is to maintain the defence of an Empire which extends over 12,000,000 of square miles and embraces a population of 400,000,000 of people. Therefore it is no use making comparisons between the army of Great Britain and the armies of France and Germany. They fight for the defence of their own frontiers. They have to maintain great land forces and to maintain them under an organisation which does not require to proceed much oversea, but which is adapted to resist attack and to make counter-attacks within a comparatively restricted area. The British Army exists for a totally different purpose, and there is no ground for comparing them. If you wish to make a comparison you must compare the British Army and Navy with the armies and navies of other Powers, and then I think you need be under no apprehension as to the result of the comparison. The first purpose for which we want any army is for oversea war. The Fleet defends our coast. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London in a most instructive and powerful speech last summer laid down the doctrine that the Navy was adequate to protect these coasts, except against raids, which could not, in his opinion, exceed 10,000 men, and were only to be feared at certain points. I do not think with my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Central Sheffield that anything has occurred in the recent manœuvres to shake our confidence in that principle. The doctrine was the result of the most careful and scientific consideration to which the late Government devoted itself, with the assistance of the most skilled experts, and it is a doctrine which, I believe, remains unshaken to-day; it is the foundation of our policy, and such raids must be met with good mobolisation schemes.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 655, *et seq.*

Then I come to the second proposition. If it be true that the Fleet is adequate, and far more than adequate, with its tremendous strength of to-day, to defend our shores, then our expeditionary force ought to be moulded for oversea warfare, and that being so, it is bound to be a finer and more costly force than that of a nation which keeps an army merely to defend itself within its own frontiers. It cannot rest upon conscription, for it requires regularly trained men for a large part of its work, giving their whole time to their duties; and consequently no conscription can be sufficient to maintain it On the other hand, it is a force that need not be large as continental forces are large. Compared from the point of view of oversea work, our available forces are enormously larger than those of the Continent. What nation is there on the Continent that could mobolise and send oversea anything like the troops we sent to South Africa? Our business is to maintain an expeditionary force just as large as to form a reserve which may enable us swiftly and resolutely to reinforce the outposts of our forces, which are the outposts of the Empire, and which acts as its police.

When you come to the necessity for expansion—we all know it may arise, but it can arise only upon great occasions—in such a case, when we are involved in such a war that the whole soul of the people has to be thrown into the task of their defence, we may assume that the people will be ready to bear their share of the burden, and if they have been prepared beforehand to organise themselves on a voluntary basis, they will be ready to respond with a strength and a might which no conscription can get out of them. But it is not only the people of this country. The South African war showed that the Empire was one and could fight as one, just as the nation could fight. Therefore you have behind the reserves of your own people the reserves of the Empire, so long as you do not alienate them—and so long as you do not gall them by fiscal restrictions—and make them feel that being within the Empire is a burden on their freedom rather than a help to it. So long as these conditions remain fulfilled, experience shows that we may rely in a supreme emergency on the whole strength of the Empire. Therefore I, for one, am not the least troubled by the alarmist cry of not finding any Reserves behind the Regular forces of the Crown unless you resort to compulsory service—conscription. The people of this country will not be dragooned into giving Military service. Lord Cardwell used to say that, so far from being a nation of shopkeepers, the British were the most fighting nation on earth. I think that the interest of our people is more profound, more real and spontaneous probably, than that of any other nation in the world. The keenness and willingness of our people to give up time to volunteering and to the study of military organisation is one of the striking features we have to deal with. It may be said indeed that the true conception of our system is that of a triangle with a sharp point of the finest tempered metal extended and resting on a broad base of metal which may be soft and yet will harden under blows.

There is another purpose which one has to bear in mind, and this is the fourth proposition which I wish to submit for consideration. It is not merely to produce an expeditionary force that we have to keep troops at home. We have to maintain for the sake of our distant possessions forces abroad which have to be fed largely from home; therefore you must maintain sufficient troops at home to keep alive and feed the troops you have got abroad. These fix the limit below which you cannot diminish your forces at home. You cannot make four except out of quantities equivalent to two and two. Therefore you must keep sufficient troops at home.

Then I come to the limit of possible reduction, and that is my fifth proposition, that it is determined by what we have to maintain abroad. In India, for example, at the present time we have a large force paid for by the Indian Government, but maintained by us because it is a British force in India. We have eleven horse, forty-two field, and three Howitzer batteries, twenty-two garrison artillery companies and six heavy batteries, nine regiments of cavalry, and fifty-two battalions of the Line, equal to a strength on Feburary 1st last of 79,446 men. We are under an obligation to keep that force up. The size of that force was determined at the time of the Mutiny. It is there, not really to resist aggression on the part of the Great Powers; it is equally there for the purpose of preserving order in India. Whether it is too large or too small, it is at any rate a force whose size was fixed at that time and the standard has never been departed from. It was, however, allowed to fall below its level until at the time of the Pendjeh incident it was brought up to its former strength. The question whether or not the circumstances of the time make it possible to reduce the force is a question outside the scope of a War Minister's authority. How does the War Minister stand in face of that obligation? One of the most brilliant of our military critics wrote lately that the War Minister was thought to be planning for war, when all that he was thinking of was to maintain and to relieve the military policemen occupied in looking after a distant frontier.

In these circumstances it is plain that if you are going to effect reductions the first thing you must look to is the state of the forces abroad. Can they be reduced? Your first reductions must be there. These are what you have to keep up. No juggling, no reverting from Cardwellian principles to other principles will help you. All the other schemes produced go to pieces before the experts and actuaries whose business it is to calculate how many drafts it will be needful to produce. As I have said, four cannot be reduced to a less equivalent than two and two when exposed to the ruthless criticism of the actuary. Nor does it do you any good to reduce establishments. If you reduce establishments you hamper yourselves in providing drafts, and you cannot reduce these without ruining the battalions. Your aim must be to do what Mr. Cardwell aimed at—to keep the number of battalions abroad and at home as near as possible equal. It is very difficult, but the nearer you approach equality the further you get away from the other difficulty in the Cardwell system, where, owing to the excess of units abroad, you have to put a certain number of battalions on short tour.

Now I come to another great principle which I touched upon when I spoke before on this important subject. At that time I began to realise—and my advisers now realise the fact most fully—the possibility of following the example of foreign nations in making use of the Militia principle. I do not mean the Militia principle in the technical sense of the word. I agree that there are certain combatant services which can only be performed by highly trained men. Much of the artillery work, for example, can only be performed by men of the highest training; but there is other work which can be done by men who have a limited military training and can take an engagement to go on mobilisation, who are fitted to perform services of a semi-civilian order to be found in every army—such work as Army service work, the provision of ammunition columns, and the Army medical work. A great deal of this can be obtained on a Militia basis. Yet somehow or other we seem to have gone on the footing throughout, almost without a break in the history of our attempts at reorganisation of the Army, of assuming that that kind of work must be performed by Regulars. I can only say that we have added enormously to the cost of the Army in that way; and one source of economy which I hope to lay before the Committee is got by the substitution in this work for the Regulars, of men who have received a partial military training in time of peace, and who are capable of taking up this kind of service on mobilisation. They are intermediate between the Regulars and the Volunteers, and they are, in the opinion of my advisers, and also judging by the experience of the foreign nations that employ them, to be got just as readily as the Regulars. They are so cheap that you can get a larger number of them for the same money or less. There are plenty of them, and they are easy to find; it is only a question of organising them.

My last proposition relates to another great source of economy besides that of the Militia principle. It has reference to the aim which should be before you as to the nature of your organisation. It must be organisation for war in a time of peace as well as on the outbreak of a war; that is to say, it does not do to pursue the haphazard policy of the past. When the South African war broke out we had at haphazard to mobilise our forces. If you take the forces which are available in the United Kingdom at the present time—Regulars, Reservists, Yeomanry, and Militia—and ask yourselves what mobilisation you can get together, you find that the force is about 330,000 in *personnel.* But you could not under the existing organisation for mobilising get more than 100,000 men, or two army corps. I have gone through the subject with the experts and actuaries, and the thing breaks down, not because the units are not there, but because there is no organisation for war which would enable us at every point to make complete arrangements for mobilisation. If we cannot mobilise for an over-sea purpose it is not because we have not the men, but because we have not the war organisation which exists in peace and a thoroughgoing plan adapted to the circumstances.

Our proposals are founded on these eight propositions. They promise certain reductions. I may at once say that I propose in the name of my colleagues that the number of British soldiers shall be 20,000 fewer Regulars than exist at the present date. I am able to say in the name of the Army Council that, considering the Army as organised through the number of men we shall be able to get under the Militia principle, we should be able to mobilise in war and keep prepared in time of peace a force which contrasts with the old force as three army corps to two. This is got by rigidly adhering to the policy of writing off everything that is useless for war purposes, by applying strictly the principle of organisation for war, by maintaining that organisation so that it shall exist in time of peace not merely on paper but in reality; so that you can mobilise your force faster almost than you can get transport to take it away. I will tell you what reductions we propose to make in the battalions abroad. When you have got the minimum below which you cannot reduce, you may as well take what you have at home and put it on the best organisation you can for the purposes of war. It costs nothing to do it, and with economy you can get a stronger force. What we have done is to go through the Army as it stands to-day unit by unit, man by man, item by item. What we have brought out is the great waste, the great extravagance, the great amount of inefficiency caused by the absence of the machinery necessary to make mobilisation possible.

I will state at once what is the nature of the force which we propose to make it possible to organise not only for war, but to organise so as to be to some extent a slumbering force ready to be awakened out of the Reserves in time of peace. It is a force which is not organised in army corps, because army corps are, in the unanimous opinion of the experts, an inconvenient form in which to keep our troops. What one wants is something real and tangible; something that does exist there in time of peace; something of which the battalions and the cavalry and the guns and the men are there and available in time of war, and have to be brought from a very short distance. The best organisation for that purpose, in the unanimous opinion of the experts—and throughout I have relied on the opinion of the experts; I have been guided by soldiers at every turn, for I myself am a mere civilian and man of business—what we have thought best for the purpose, after four months close consideration, is an organisation, not in army corps, and not in small divisions such as exist now, of which we could have nine out of the materials we have to keep at home for maintaining our drafts abroad, but six big divisions—I am talking of infantry—organised on a pattern to correspond with our forces in India. We think it important to make our Army here accord as nearly and as closely as possible with the organisation in India, in case—which Heaven forbid!—our forces should have to act together in some great emergency in defence of the Indian frontier upon Indian plains. Therefore the force at which we aim is a force of six big divisions, with the proper equipment of cavalry, which according to the latest war establishment calculations, would be four cavalry brigades for that force. We have more cavalry than that, and I do not cut off a single unit of cavalry. Cavalry is a very valuable and important arm, and we propose to keep our cavalry. Six big divisions of infantry with four cavalry brigades and full artillery would equal three army corps, or nine of the old-fashioned divisions, and represent a total of 150,000 men. These would consist of 50,000 Regulars serving with the colours, 70,000 Reservists, and 30,000 people who are employed and trained on Militia lines — that is to say, giving only part of their time for war training and part for peace, but who are under an engagement to come out on mobilisation. This number falls short of what we are bound to keep in this country for the maintenance of the force we have abroad. We have considered in the Defence Committee to what extent the force abroad could under existing circumstances be reduced. There are troubles in Egypt; things are not wholly clear or settled in South Africa; there are difficulties in various parts of the Empire; and yet, after survey, the Defence Committee is quite clear, and we are quite clear, that we can reduce seven battalions abroad and three battalions at home. The Committee may remember that in the course of the war there were a number of battalions added to the existing regiments so as to improve our strength; these battalions, I think, numbered sixteen or seventeen; but they were reduced, and to-day there are fourteen line battalions which did not exist ten years ago. Of these battalions we are in a position immediately to cut down eight; whether we can cut down some more afterwards depends on considerations of general policy, but I wish in this matter to go cautiously. The Government does not wish to undertake anything they cannot perform and perform with absolute safety. Therefore, we see our way to reduce eight out of the fourteen battalions, and I think in that proposition we are doing nothing extravagant and nothing that will come as a surprise to right hon. Gentlemen opposite. Having reduced these eight battalions, we shall still have to support troops abroad with drafts to an extent which requires a force considerably larger than the regular force which I have indicated. Therefore, when I say we propose to organise a force of six big divisions, amounting to 150,000 men, including Militia men, I am really not increasing the troops which we have had up to the present time available for such a purpose, but I am diminishing them, and by reorganisation I am able to produce a larger amount of units available for organisation.

Why is this? Now I come to a mystery, a great mystery, the mystery of the existing condition of our artillery system. Let us see how that stands. Mr. Brodrick, in his letter, said our proposals as regards the artillery portended a national calamity. That seems to me to show what I came to suspect in the course of the searching investigation which I have had to make into this matter, that the late Government never knew how they stood as regards artillery. You gave the nation new field guns and new horse artillery guns. They are excellent guns. The reports I have on all hands are most satisfactory as to their efficiency. But there is one thing which it does not seem to have occurred to you to give us, and that was men to mobilise them. Would the Committee believe it, out of ninety-three batteries of field artillery which we have at home at the present time, if to-day we were called upon to mobilise them—there is no secrecy about these figures, I daresay the general staffs of foreign nations have already found them out—you could only mobilise forty-two. Only forty-two out of ninety-three. All these guns would have been delivered complete by the end of the financial year, but your programme of ninety-three complete field artillery batteries, of which we have heard so much, has only resulted in this, that if we went to war at the present time we could only by using our last man put forty-two of them into the field. Why was this? It seems to have been forgotten that the new guns were quick-firing guns, and used a great deal more ammunition than the old-fashioned fifteen-pounders; and the result of requiring more ammunition, of course, is that your ammunition columns have to be longer than is the case at the present time, and require many more men to mobilise. These batteries would have required at the lowest estimate 10,000 more men than you had available for the purpose. I you had provided these 10,000 men upon the Regular basis it would have cost you something like £600,000 a year, which was not proposed as part of the artillery reconstruction scheme of the Government. We poor innocents on this side of the House did not know what was going on, and the result was that we in our innocence were under the comfortable delusion that we possessed an artillery equipment which would mobilise something approaching ninety-three field batteries of field artillery. The dilemma is either that a mistake was made, or else that His Majesty's late advisers thought the only field force that they required was a field force equivalent to four of these big divisions of which I have spoken, for four was the utmost amount which the artillery they had available would mobilise, and in that case they certainly cannot object to the very modest reduction which I have proposed in point of view of *personnel*.

My criticisms are grave criticisms, and they are criticisms which I am going to make good in detail; but lest the Committee should say that "after all, it is only a civilian who is speaking, and the Government must have had experts at their back," let me say that my statements and the figures I give are founded on the most minute investigation made by our General Staff and in the Adjutant-General's Department, and that the figures have been tested and examined at every turn, so that I do not think myself—and I have been accustomed to criticise various kinds of business in the course of other avocations—that there is the least doubt about them.

First of all, assuming that the position is as I have said, how do we stand at the present time? At the present time you have got about 17,000 Regulars to mobilise for your artillery, and 3,000 besides who are unfit, for you do not send men abroad who are under a year's service, or under twenty years of age. Even taking men who are quite unfit, who have served only six months, and who are not up to the standard, the position of matters was that with your 17,000 Regulars after mobilising forty-two batteries of field artillery, you would have to use up the last man who was available for ammunition columns; not one other man could have been got, and the remaining fifty-three batteries, therefore, would have been broken up altogether and could not have been used for any purpose. How is that to be got over? I found myself confronted with this very formidable thing, and at first I was appalled at the prospect of having to spend money in creating new additions to the regular force of artillery; but on reflection, and looking about, I made more discoveries. It is a most valuable thing, a survey of the Army as a whole. It is not only the things you are deficient in you find out, but the things that have been uselessly applied to other purposes, and which you can make available to the end of filling up gaps. I found that, in accordance with principles which had been sanctioned by my predecessors, the theory of our coast defence had been reviewed with the result that a reduction was necessitated of over 300 guns. They had either become obsolete or were not adapted to modern theories of defence. That was the work of the Navy, of the War Office, and of the Defence Committee in conjunction; and as the outcome of it, I found that I had a very large number of Militia-garrison Artillery who were released from any useful duty, and a somewhat large number of Regulars, approaching 2,000 in addition. That was a very great comfort to me, because I felt I might be able to put the Regular artillery into such a position as to deliver the nation from a national calamity. There were these garrison artillerymen, amounting to somewhere between 13,000 and 14,000. We consulted the Commanding Officers of regiments, and the suggestion that we should use them for this purpose came originally from one of them, Colonel Blake, of the Northumberland Militia—whom I must thank for the great help he has given us, and the many suggestions he has made about this work—and from other Militia artillery colonels, who very reluctantly, seeing the change that has come over their force, have come to the conclusion that it is better that it should assume a new *role* than that it should disappear altogether. We get therefore these 13,000 or 14,000 men, who do not cost us a penny more than at the present time, and we propose to utilise their services for making up that defect in the machine, in the organisation of our field force as a whole, which prevents it from working at the present time. We should be able to get the 10,000 men that are necessary for the ammunition columns, and to get in addition that support which, I need not say, is wholly non-existent at the present time. In that way not only shall we be able to mobilise a very much larger force of artillery than is the case at present, but we shall save a good deal of money on the transaction. Instead of increasing the cost, strange as it may seem, we assume—I do not wish to be too sanguine about it—we shall be saving £300,000 a year on what we spend at present.

It would have taken a very large sum to supply material on a Regular basis.

The Committee may naturally ask, "Are you sure that these Militiamen will do their work?" and my answer is, "Yes, the General Staff are perfectly sure," and I will say why. We believe we can get the class of men we require to assume this new *role*, and the officers will be content to train them and to make them efficient field artillery Militia, to train them with a view to their ultimately doing the work of the ammunition column part of the organisation of artillery, and going through training which will enable many of them to become skilled gunners and a Reserve for the artillery if necessary. But we shall go very strongly for this, that every man shall show justification for the money spent upon him; and therefore, if these garrison Militiamen do not take service we shall be bound to say, "We have no more use for you in maintaining the war organisation of the Army, and we shall spend the money on others who will be willing to take your place," and we think we know where we can put our hands on them. But we have no reason to anticipate there will be any large deficiency in the number willing to assume this new *role*; and we know if we give them proper training we shall get sufficient men for the ammunition columns. The training of Reserves to maintain the artillery in the field has also to be considered. We are quite clear that for non-commissioned officers, for servers, for layers, for bombardiers, you require a highly trained class of men, not to be obtained from the Militia service; but, like Admiral Fisher's ship, we shall have a nucleus crew which will be supplemented upon mobilisation from the Militia, and in this way we hope on mobilisation to form effective reserve batteries.

Let us see how it will work. What will be the strength of the new artillery establishment, and what will be the war establishment? What is the artillery strength of the Great Powers of Europe at this moment? My right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean, who has studied these matters closely, knows that a tremendous controversy is raging in France and Germany as to the right number of guns for a battery—the controversies we have had here upon religious teaching have been hardly more keen than that abroad upon the number of guns there should be in a battery. That controversy arises out of the fact that the new quick-firing guns consume an enormous quantity of ammunition, and for this reason they cannot be put into the field in such large numbers as in the days of the old slow-firing guns. The result is that France, which has a very fine artillery establishment, has a war establishment of 3·5 guns to every 1,000 bayonets and sabres. Japan has a war establishment of 4·5, and Germany a proportion of 5·5. But Germany is just introducing a new quick-firing gun, and we do not know what the proportion may ultimately be. Great Britain has the proportion of five quick-firing guns to 1,000 bayonets and sabres, and we do not propose to reduce that. Although the gun is a new quick-firing gun we want to be perfectly safe in this all-important arm, and therefore, though it is a more rapid gun, we propose to maintain the five-gun proportion to every 1,000 bayonets or sabres. Starting with this, let us see what the establishment will be in peace and war, respectively. The Committee knows it is always possible to show a considerable saving if in time of peace you resolutely put everything possible into the reserve, so that you are enabled to call up every man at the right time, and so maintain the higher establishment under which you mobilise for war. This is a principle that leads to economy, and it has hitherto partly been applied to the artillery. The General Staff propose to apply it thoroughly, saving money by keeping the batteries on a reserve basis in time of peace. Every nation on the Continent does that. In France the war establishment is five officers on the basis of a four-gun battery; in other ranks a war establishment of 169 and a peace establishment of 129. In Germany they have organised batteries on three scales in time of peace. In an army corps kept on the western frontier there is a six-gun establishment, but that is only one. Germany keeps batteries in time of peace on a three-fold establishment—a higher establishment of four guns, and six on mobilisation, with 127 men to five officers; a medium establishment of 115 men, and a lower of 102 men, officers being the same, and horses in proportion. Now I come to our own case. We propose to follow the same principle, to keep our six-gun batteries on a four-gun establishment in time of peace, and we likewise propose to have five officers to 117 men—rather more than France—and sixty horses; France has sixty-one. We propose to keep to ninety-nine batteries, eighty-one on a four-gun basis—I will tell the Committee why we come to this conclusion—and eighteen more on a two-gun basis for quite a different purpose. The artillery establishment for a six-division force such as I have described would be sixty-three batteries, and, with the Militia ammunition columns we shall be easily able completely to mobilise that and provide all the drafts required. But in order to help ourselves and to provide, above all, for the training of Militiamen we propose to keep in reserve the remaining thirty-six batteries. We shall bring home six batteries of field artillery from South Africa, which are useless there, and arm them with new guns.

I think, having regard to the importance of artillery, to which the Powers are more and more awakening, to which the General Staff are awake, and of which the Army Council is convinced, we ought to encourage the artillery in every way we can consistently. We propose to take the old field guns and, making a new departure, issue them to the Volunteers, who will then have an opportunity of organising themselves into a sort of national artillery reserve. I do not imagine that with such weapons they could take the field against quick-firing guns, but I think this will enable Volunteers to put themselves into a very useful position. These old 15-pounders could be converted at a reasonable cost into quick-firers and made a useful gun; I do not say for the Regular Army, but a good gun, good as some Powers possess, and they will serve the purpose of giving Volunteers the training by which they may become a sort of reserve of national artillery. We take thirty-six batteries of new quick-firing guns for a specific purpose. We want to train 20,000 men of the Militia artillery with these guns, and we propose instead of bringing the people to the guns to take the guns to the people. Just now the practice is to bring the Northumberland and the Fife Militia for training to Portsmouth. We propose to give the men training nearer their homes, and we shall do this with a little inconvenience and as much elasticity as possible; we do not intend that there shall be a uniform cast-iron rule, to enable them to go through the mill for the ammunition column. Of the thirty-six batteries, eighteen will be on a four-gun basis and eighteen on a two-gun basis. The two-gun basis is better for training; you can train more men, arrangements can be made in such a fashion that you pass more men quickly through the mill. There are reasons, however, why we must keep eighteen batteries on the four-gun basis; we must provide drafts for abroad. Therefore, from the point of view of training, of supplying drafts, of efficiency and of economy, we take the course I have suggested, we use up the garrison artillery, increase the number of mobilisable batteries to sixty-three, put thirty-six more in the Reserve, with eighteen on a four-gun, eighteen on a two-gun basis, and, increasing the organisation by 50 per cent., we have £300,000 a year less expenditure. I have only to add that in India and the Colonies we propose to keep the batteries on the six-gun war establishment. We think that will be wiser, because we cannot get reserves out quickly enough in case of emergency. Therefore, in India and the Colonies nothing will be done.

There are at the present time of Horse Artillery in the country fourteen batteries. We do not propose to touch the Horse Artillery. We wish to put it on a four-gun basis in time of peace, and so save a good deal of money, and we have made certain rearrangements at the depôts which will result in substantial economy. But we leave the Horse Artillery untouched. The proper footing on a war establishment for the force I have described of six divisions is by agreement on all hands ten batteries. There would be a battery for each of the four cavalry brigades, that is the original establishment, and six batteries in addition for the corps—one for each division. So we should use ten batteries and keep four surplus batteries, partly for the purpose of training and finding drafts, and partly as a reserve of Horse Artillery. The Horse Artillery, is of course, a highly skilled arm and has to be manned almost, if not quite, entirely by Regulars, and therefore the Militia principle of which I have spoken does not apply to them. But I think the savings we have made on the Artillery generally are so substantial that I am not only justified, but I think it is right that I should keep up this arm, which is extremely difficult to train, and which it is impossible to improvise at short notice. Now I think I have put before the Committee the important features of our artillery proposals. I think I am justified in saying that their result is very different from the result anticipated by intelligent calculators who predicted that we were going to ruin the national artillery and put things on a very much worse basis than they were before.

Having got my artillery, I now return to the expeditionary force, which I could not complete up to six divisions—I think four divisions were all that could be mobilised—in the absence of proper artillery at the present time. I will give the Committee the figures which compose the expeditionary force. Speaking from memory—I will give the exact figures presently—they are something over 154,000 men, of whom some 30,000 will be on a Militia basis, 50,000 Regulars with the Colours,and 70,000 Regular reservists. Well, we have for that at home seventy-one battalions of the Line. You must have these battalions, because you have to keep up, after taking off the eight battalions I have described, seventy-seven battalions abroad. There being seventy-one battalions that have to be kept up, in constructing my expeditionary force I have left myself a margin. There may come a time of profound peace or, better still, the nations may resolve to reduce their armaments on a large scale. In that case, and with a view to that possibility, at all events, our object has been to produce a force which you could contract or expand, and to make it so that in its proportions it could respond accordingly. Therefore we think it right not to organise the expeditionary force up to the full limit of the troops we are compelled to keep at home, but to leave ourselves a margin so that, without interfering with the expeditionary force which we have constructed, you could make in the future, if it were possible to do so in view of things which go far beyond my department, a reduction without impairing the efficiency for war of your field force. Therefore, I say, instead of the whole of my seventy-one battalions of the Line which I have to keep at home, I take only sixty-six of these battalions for the purpose of constructing the expeditionary force. I use in addition six battalions of the Guards—I am coming to the Guards a little later—making seventy-two battalions of infantry altogether. That gives me five battalions of the Line and a certain number of battalions of the Guards surplus. I have four brigades of cavalry on the proper cavalry equipment, that is twelve regiments; and as we have fifteen regiments available—I think one has just gone to Egypt, so the number is fourteen at present—there is a margin of cavalry in case of necessity. There has been no reduction of cavalry. The artillery I have described; it consists of sixty-three batteries of field and ten batteries of horse, with the surplus which I have described. I should say that in addition to that, as hon. Gentlemen who know the organisation of the Army are aware, there is a certain reserve of guns over and above the guns in these batteries always kept in case of guns getting worn out or destroyed in operations. All these we have preserved.

How, then, is it possible for us to get a much larger mobilisation and yet save a great deal of money on it? Before this time the units were there and more units were kept up. We are taking off eight battalions of the Line and two battalions of the Guards. The reason for that I will come to presently. We are taking off, besides, a large number of Regulars who were employed for purposes which, in the opinion of the General Staff, could be amply discharged as they are discharged on the Continent, on a Militia basis. That has enabled us to make a reduction approaching 20,000 Regular soldiers and at the same time mobilise a far larger force. Why? The units were there before, more units than I have left after these reductions. But they could not be mobilised, partly for want of artillery and partly because there were deficiencies in other points, and it has been so expensive to make things up that the proper provision has not been made. This provision of a Militia basis, which it is easy to keep up, has enabled us to reduce the Regulars in the Army service work, transport, and supply. A great deal of the work done in the field can be done well by Pickford's drivers—men who are trained as well as Pickford's drivers and would be also possible combatants—in connection with ammunition columns, the Army Medical Service, and a number of other services which it would be easy for me to go into if I were not in a hurry.

But I have so much ground to to cover that I will proceed at once to the further details of the organisation of the new force. For this purpose it will probably be for the convenience of right hon. Gentlemen opposite if I give them a spare copy of the table and certain notes which I have prepared, which show what the composition of the force is. In that way we shall get much more easily to an understanding of the composition of the new force. If the right hon. Gentlemen will look at the statement on page 3, which is signed by Sir Frederick Stopford, who is responsible, with his experts, for working out this plan, he will find the composition of the force as it has been approved by the Army Council. First of all the total number is 5,546 officers and 154,074 men of all ranks. Those who are on the non-Regular basis—that is to say, who do not require continuous military training, are a certain number of those who are put down as cavalry. By cavalry I mean mounted troops, speaking more accurately. The purpose of the Government, as I have said more than once, has been to go through every department of the Army and ask each man, "What are you here for? Do you justify the money that is spent upon you?" If he cannot answer he goes off ruthlessly. If he can make out a case of efficiency for war he remains. We have applied that method to the Regulars, and we also propose to apply it to the Auxiliary Forces, with such modifications as are requisite. For instance there is an admirable force which, I am glad to say, we have been able to turn to good uses, the Yeomanry. We put to them the question, "Can you furnish us with what we want?" We do not want them as mounted infantry, because mounted infantry are to be only a small force on a Regular footing, and I think it is the general opinion that mounted troops pull back the cavalry when sent into action with them. It is as divisional troops with the division that we propose to ask the Yeomanry to act, and they are very willing to provide us with 3,240 men at least. We are not driven to refer to the Yeomanry for that purpose, because, as I have said, we have three brigades of cavalry surplus; but still we should like to use the Yeomanry for this purpose. We want to encourage the best Yeomanry to make this part of the Regular Army on mobilisation; and we hope to use 3,240 mounted men, who will be supplied by the Yeomanry, and who will go with the division and act as divisional troops, hold positions, and perform various other services which mounted men who are fairly trained as rifle shots can do with great advantage. Then in the second column of non-Regulars there are 10,337 artillerymen. These are the ammunition columns, of which I have spoken. Then there are engineer services, railway work, telegraph work, and so on, men whom we get in the same fashion. Infantry is left blank for the reasons I will give presently. Army Service Corps, 10,000; Royal Army Medical Corps, Veterinary Department, Ordnance, 30,857 men in all, to be put upon the non-Regular basis.

That is the force. Suppose you send it out in its entirety; and suppose you are engaged in a great war, I should be asked, What provision have you made for wastage? My answer is, We have calculated pretty accurately the wastage, and it is appallingly large. The wastage in an average great war is not far short of 80 per cent. per annum. You cannot calculate it at less. For six months you have to calculate for a wastage of 40 per cent., that is to say, of some 56,000 men. And the way we supply that wastage is this, partly out of the surplus people whom we have got and partly out of certain people whom we train on a non-Regular basis, but largely out of infantry, in whose aid we requisition certain existing Militia, with modifications which I shall have to describe. We have, of course, a considerable number of Infantry of the Line over in the surplus battalions. We also have a surplus of reservists and of young men who, in the first six months of a war, will have matured. These form not only the nucleus, but the greater part. We shall want 9,000 more during the first six months. It is proposed to ask the Militia to furnish them in their units so that we can make them available, if not in their battalions at all events in no smaller unit than their company. I will come to that in due course; but I think I have now explained provisionally the composition of the expeditionary force.

The reductions in cost in the case of Army reorganisation come, I need not say, from a reduction of the *personnel* of the Regulars, just as in the Navy they come from the reduction of ships. We get our reduction in this way. We get approaching 9,000 men by reducing ten battalions of infantry of different kinds. We get a reduction of Regulars who are employed for garrison artillery purposes which are now obsolete—those 300 guns of which I spoke which are coming off our coast defences because our coast defences are organised on quite other principles. There is a reduction there of nearly 2,000 Regulars. Then there are large reductions in the artillery consequent upon supplementing them upon a non-Regular basis and a reorganisation of depots and other matters, amounting to a reduction of about 3,850 men. Then there are a lot of miscellaneous reductions. We have scrutinised everything in every corner, and we have found men redundant—too many engineers here, too many Army Service men there, and with a number of minor items which I need not go into now, except to say that they include the Wei-hai-Wei Regiment, and we get, roughly speaking, about 20,000 men.

I want to say something to the Committee on which I lay great emphasis. The Committee is urging economy, and I think I have shown them the prospect of good reductions. I do not want to estimate these things in money at this moment for a reason, beyond saying this, that you will see, if I am not very much mistaken, a very handsome and substantial reduction in the next Estimates. But you will not reap the full fruit, and some of you may be disappointed with the amount, and I will tell you why. Whatever we do there is one thing which I am sure the Committee would not wish. I hate to be the instrument to disband fine battalions of men. I hate, and the Government hate, and we all hate to disturb existing arrangements, and we feel that to every extent that we can, whether we disband soldiers of the line or discharge workmen from factories because munitions of war have not to be made to so great an extent, or whether we reduce staff, we ought to do it as gently as possible so as not to allow the individual to suffer more than we possibly can help. Therefore we propose to act on the policy of making these reductions gradually. Fortunately we are in a very happy position. I never before had occasion to bless the three years enlistment system which was introduced some years ago and abolished by the late Government. It was a system which failed wholly of its purpose. It was introduced to get over certain difficulties at the time, and the result of it has been to produce a very large Reserve. But that Reserve has been produced by a constant exodus out of the battalions, men coming out because their three years term is over and because they do not want to re-engage, with the result that, while the reserves are large, enormous, at the present time, the battalions have been far under strength. That comes in as the very gift of Providence, so to speak, because it enables me to absorb, at any rate, a considerable number of the men of the disbanded battalions who may choose to go into them. We do not know who will care to go in and who will not. These things are very difficult to gauge, but we want to help the soldiers in every way we can out of the difficult position in which we are putting them. We do not propose to send any man out into the street if we can possibly avoid it, and we think we can provide for all the men and officers by absorption if we only take a little time. We have worked out schemes for that purpose with all the care we can, and I hope the result will be that the blow, if it falls, as it does fall, on battalions which it has taken many years to bring up to their present, in many cases, admirable condition, is a blow which will be softened by the merciful measures we are taking. It, of course, retards to a certain extent the immediate fruits of your economy, but, if you give us some months in which to make every man his offer, you will get something very handsome and substantial, and the rest will lie, not *in nubibus*, but at a distance of time that you can see and where you can put your hand on the full fruits. So much for the economy side of these reductions.

Now I come to what, I am sure, the Committee await a little anxiously to know: What are the infantry reductions that we propose to make? Which are the ten battalions? I will take first the case of the Guards. Our proposal is to reduce the ten battalions of the Guards by two. The Guards up to 1897 consisted of seven battalions. Three battalions were added, one in 1897, the 3rd Coldstream, and the others in 1899, the 3rd Scots. And when these were instituted Lord Lansdowne, who was then War Minister, stated that—

> "it is proposed that of the nine battalions to which the establishment of the Guards will be raised by the creation of two new battalions, three shall be employed on garrison duty in the Mediterranean,"

with a view to relieving the strain on the short-tour battalions. That never came about. The purpose for which these battalions were called into existence was never fulfilled, and the result has been that the Guards have been used for another purpose. They have been used for the purpose of forming a brigade, one of the most admirable brigades in the British Army, at Aldershot. The first question that will be put to me is, "Why do you not reduce something else than the Guards?" I answer that question by saying because the first consideration is not only efficiency, but efficiency tempered by justice. It would not have been fair, it would not have been possible, to make the whole of the reduction in the infantry of the Line. The infantry of the Line are, after all, the battalions which do foreign service work and which feed battalions abroad, and thus for every battalion that I struck out of the infantry of the Line I should have destroyed two battalions—that battalion and the battalion it fed abroad. Consequently I could not reduce, under the present condition of affairs abroad, more battalions of the infantry of the Line. The next question which I came to was this: Did I require these two battalions of the Guards for my expeditionary force, and my answer was clearly I did not. I require only six battalions of the Guards; I had ten; I propose, therefore, to reduce two. I could not justify them for the purpose of the expeditionary force, because the expeditionary force requires so many battalions of the Line, and I could not reduce those battalions of the Line still lower. Nor could I justify, that being so, the proposition to continue spending £120,000 a year upon those two battalions. I find my occupation, in many respects, a hard one. It requires a ruthless determination in pursuing a purpose without looking to the right or to the left, but I must look to the interests of the whole before looking to the interests of the part, and I solemnly say this to the Committee—that unless I am free to pursue these things in that way I can neither reorganise the Army on the basis of efficiency for war nor get down the cost of it to an amount which this House and the country will tolerate. It is better for the Army, it is better for the Guards themselves, that the Guards should bear their just share of reduction, and that they should be dealt with in this way.

I want to say a word about the Aldershot Brigade. I have seen that brigade and learned to admire it, and I should rather not have seen it parted. But, with our reorganisation of the Guards, we shall be able to put Aldershot in just as good a position as it was before. We propose on mobilisation to have two brigades of Guards at Aldershot in the future instead of one, as at the present time. Only one of those brigades will be constantly at Aldershot in peace, and it will be a brigade which trains with two battalions of Guards and two battalions of the Line—a mixed brigade. There are many very distinguished infantry commanders who maintain that a mixed brigade is a more efficient force in war than a brigade of battalions of the Line alone. I see my right hon. friend (Colonel Kenyon-Slaney) shaking his head. He is a military expert, and I am not; but I will tell him what was said to me just two days ago by a very distinguished general who had gone through the full experience of the thing. He said—

> "The old seasoned Linesman, although he may not in some respects be as fine as a picked man of the Guards, is a man with a good deal of experience, and he can teach the Guardsman, when he goes abroad, some things that the Guardsman does not know. I have commanded a mixed brigade, with the result that I think one of the most perfect combinations you could have is Guardsmen and Linesmen in equal proportion."

Acting upon that advice and on other opinions, we have so arranged that I do not think the Aldershot training brigade will suffer much in the future by the system of two battalions of Guards and two of the Line. Every battalion of the Guards will, in the organisation we are working out, go through the mill at Aldershot every fourth year. Moreover, in the Aldershot command, which, in the future, will consist of two of these big divisions, in the second division there will be, on mobilisation, a brigade of Guards organised in peace for the outbreak of war, but not continuously stationed at Aldershot in peace like the mixed brigade which I have just described. I believe that the new organisation will be looked at with a not unfriendly eye by a good many people in the Guards, who feel that the keeping of four battalions at Aldershot constantly imposed a strain which was too heavy to bear. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon put some questions designed to bring out figures on the subject of the Guards Reserve. I know nothing more absolutely misleading than the calculation which the right hon. Gentleman made which showed that the Guardsman with the average cost of the reservist worked out at a very cheap rate. The figure adopted was £29 odd, I think. Questions have also been addressed to me the purpose of which is to bring out that the cost of a linesman is very much greater. The comparison is quite misleading. If you take the linesman on the seven and five years enlistment system, taking into consideration that India pays part of the cost of the Reserve, because India pays the cost of the battalion when it is in service which produces a part of the Reserve, you will find that the average cost of the linesman is very little if at all different from that of the Guardsman on three years service. The Guardsman is an expensive man, his cost is necessarily rather high. The result is that, looking at the matter from the point of view of efficiency and economy, it is not possible for us to defend the maintenance of the Guards at the strength of battalions to which they were raised since 1897, and the justification of which seems to us to have disappeared. But when you come to what we are to do with them, I am glad to say we shall be able to proceed in such a fashion as, I think, will not injure them any more than can be avoided. We propose to begin with the reduction of the 3rd Scots Guards, taking time for the absorption of the men. Nobody will be deprived of his pay as the process goes on. We shall then proceed with the reduction of the 3rd Coldstream Guards, but there will necessarily be an interval before the reduction takes place. Do not let there be any mistake about this. There is no doubt in our minds about reducing the battalion. *Transivit in rem judicatam*; we made up our minds that the thing has got to be done; but there will necessarily be an interval of time, and in that interval we propose to ask the Coldstream Guards—their third battalion—to undertake an honourable and important task, that of relieving a battalion in Egypt. They are a fine battalion, and it is only the necessities which arise from the consideration of the organisation of the Army as a whole that has laid upon us the painful task of reducing them also.

I pass from that to the eight battalions of infantry of the Line which we are going to reduce. At the present time this is our position. There are in India fifty-two battalions, there are in the Colonies thirty-two, and at home seventy-two—that is to say, there are twelve more battalions at present abroad than there are at home. If eight battalions are to be reduced, we have worked out with the Defence Committee that this is the proper course to pursue—and this is entirely approved by the Committee and by the Army and Navy authorities—to bring away three battalions from South

Africa, replacing them by one cavalry regiment—they want mounted troops there —and, if necessary, another cavalry regiment. That will leave ten battalions in Africa, but not at full strength. We propose, in order to make the ten that remain effective, to use the substance of one of the three battalions to be brought home to be disbanded for strengthening up the other battalions in Africa. There will be ten battalions of infantry instead of thirteen weak battalions, their strength being brought up to 840. There will be an additional cavalry regiment, and another, if necessary, available to go out. In the opinion of my military advisers, that puts South Africa in a better position than at present, because it provides it with a more mobile force. In the next place we propose to make reductions in Malta. The establishment of the battalions there is at present seven, and in the opinion of the Defence Committee it ought not to be more than five. Malta has become more and more of naval and less and less of military importance. It is of use only as a station for troops, and it is not a healthy place. We have decided that one battalion shall come away from Gibraltar, which again is more a naval than a military station, and one will come from Ceylon, where it is not wanted. The result of the whole is that we have to reduce the battalions, which means that we have to bring home battalions from abroad, and select the battalions, which must be of course linked at home, which we can reduce.

Now we had to consider what principle we should go on, whether to select battalions from regiments, junior, on sentimental grounds, or to select them from those regiments for which we had been unable to obtain the necessary recruits and bring them up to the establishment. We decided unanimously to go for numerical efficiency and not sentimental considerations — that we should reduce the battalions inefficient in point of strength—and that being so, we had to determine which. This is the decision of the Government: The third and fourth battalions of the Northumberland Fusiliers, the third and fourth battalions of the Royal Warwickshire Regiment, the third and fourth battalions of the Lancashire Fusiliers, and the third and fourth battalions of the Manchester Regiment. All these regiments are very largely short.

The terms of enlistment are very important, and we have given close consideration to that. As the Committee knows, Mr. Cardwell originally proposed in the short service scheme as it first stood, that the terms should be six years with the colours and six with the reserve. Afterwards it became seven and five. Then there was the unfortunate three years experiment, with nine, from which a jump had to be made to the other end nine and three, to increase the men with the colours. That is too large, in our opinion, and after very great consideration the Adjutant-General, to whom I cannot express my obligations sufficiently deeply for the immense amount of work he has thrown into this part of my proposals, has presented me with these recommendations, which are adopted by the Army Council and the Government. The terms of enlistment for the infantry of the Line will be, as a general rule, seven and five, with the extra year. The Guards will remain three and nine; they do not go abroad. The cavalry will be seven and five, with the extra year necessary; no change. The field and horse artillery, instead of being three and nine, will be six and six. The garrison artillery will be eight and four. What we want is to get highly-trained Reserve men. I have stated that we propose to reduce the Irish Guards, which was a battalion of colossal proportions, from 920 rank and file to 820. The cavalry we do not touch, nor do we touch the Household Cavalry. The Infantry of the Line establishment, 805 non-commissioned officers and men, can be well reduced to 775, but one cannot go below that, otherwise one would not get the drafts; and even then that is above the average actual strength at the present moment. The result of the whole process is that, whereas we have now 156 battalions of the Line, of which fifty-two are in India, thirty-two in the colonies, and seventy-two at home, we shall have fifty-two in India, twenty-five only in the colonies, and seventy-one at home, making 148 in all. That is where I get my reduction. With regard to the Reserve, which is very large, we propose this year to close the entrance to Section D.

I have put before the Committee the full effect of the reductions, and I want to pass on to another topic which intimately concerns the soldier. We have gone with great care in the last few months into the question of how we can find some employment for the soldier in a more systematic fashion after he leaves his profession, and how we can best teach him a trade, and generally improve his material position. I do not think we can lay too much stress on the proposition that it is important that we should get quality as well as quantity. The reductions will enable us to put forward a higher standard of quality than we have hitherto been able to enforce, and we hope to accompany that by an effort to make the social condition of the soldier better than it is at the moment. For that purpose Sir E. Ward undertook to preside over a committee which has sat unremittingly on the whole question, and that committee has presented a Report which has been laid on the Table, and will be printed and issued in a few days. It contains a vast amount of material and a number of propositions, many of which, at any rate, we hope to be able to carry into effect. It will require a good deal of work, and Sir E. Ward and his colleagues propose to take it in hand as soon as the Report is laid.

Then there is another point of vital importance, the health of the Army. There have been some reproaches in the papers that we have been saying nothing about sanitary reform in the Army and the improvement of our medical system. It is not a subject which, connected intimately as I am through family ties with medicine and science, I am likely to have neglected, and I am glad to say I have had working for me in this direction Sir Alfred Keogh, Surgeon-General, and the head of the Medical Department of the Army, than whom there is no more skilled man anywhere. He has provided a scheme which is already partly in operation, and I propose to deal with the health of the Army in this fashion. It is all part of our organisation for war, which I am going to detail in a few words. We propose, on the outbreak of war, to treat the Army on the basis of looking after the health of the unit as one thing, and the health of the base and lines of communication as another thing. The chief sources of disease are contact with infection, imperfect disposal of *excreta*, and impure water supply. All these things are being separately dealt with. Small things in themselves, they multiply the evils to enormous dimensions when dealing with great bodies of troops. First of all, field army conditions are quite different from those of the base and line of communications, and therefore it is necessary that there should be systematic teaching, not only of medical officers, but of the combatant officers, in order to enable them to apply the best results of medical science to the preservation of the health of their units. Our medical training we propose very largely to improve. We have already taken the decision to make the instruction of officers include health matters and medical matters as far as they bear on the health of their companies, as well as other matters. We propose to give instruction not only to the officers but to the men. The Medical Department has prepared a manual of instruction for the soldier, and henceforth it is to be the duty of the company officer not only to read and understand that manual himself, but also to see that his men read and understand it. We have also provided a medical school at Aldershot which is now training our medical officers. When we organise for war it is intended that the unit of organisation shall consist of one medical officer, one non-commissioned officer, and four men of the Army Medical Corps, who will have to look after the water supply and other such services; and one commissioned officer who will supervise the sanitary police duties. These men will be trained at the new school of hygiene at Aldershot. A line of communication will be organised for the preservation of health and the prevention of disease on something like the organisation of a civil community. It is intended to form sanitary sections who will not have to attend to the sick, but to look after the health of the troops and the prevention of disease. There will also be a general sanitary commission who, working at the base, will provide for requirements as they crop up. In that work the combatant officer and the medical officer will be brought together. We think they cannot be in too close a communication. Of course, for skilled medical work, we look to the trained medical officer. But there is a great deal of other medical service which can only be attended to by the authority of the combatant officer. We have learned a great deal in this matter from the Japanese; but we have learned a great deal more from the studies of our own people themselves. They have worked out the problem of how to purify water by a new system of filtration. We have arranged at Aldershot for a regular sanitary campaign on lines as it would be carried out in war. The water there will be declared impure—which is a great farce, as Aldershot is excellently supplied with water—and the water will be brought from a new source of supply in order to see how our organisation would work out in war. I believe we shall have as good a medical service as any in the world, if not better, and have it with something in the way of economy. We are able to reduce the provision of hospital accommodation in war from 10 to 7 per cent., which is a substantial economy.

I have now said what I have got to say on the subject of the Regular Forces. I will deal shortly with the subject of the Auxiliary Forces, for I am ashamed of having engaged the attention of the Committee so long. His Majesty's Government have deemed it to be their duty to put to the Auxiliary Forces precisely the same question as they have put to the Regular Army. That is —"What purpose do you serve in war?" But before I enter upon this branch of my subject, I want the Committee to understand the difficulties which confront the reformer right through the whole organisation of the Army. There has been a want of plan, a want of method; and things have grown up like mushrooms haphazardly, you do not know how or why. It is not only in regard to the Regulars that great wastage has taken place; it has taken place also in the Auxiliaries, and you come across it even in departments where you least expect it. One would have thought that in regard to the food supply of the Regular Army things would be closely looked into. About two months ago I found a contract for the supply of meat in which it was said that the meat must be home bred. I know that I am now touching on a dangerous topic, in which members from Ireland take a great interest. Well, I thought the condition about home-bred a little awkward, so I myself struck it out and put in "home-killed" instead. That has been in operation for two months Two results have ensued from it. One was a comfort not to the home-breeder but to myself. That was that we have saved a farthing on every ration, or £50,000 a year, which is a neat little economy to effect on a meat contract on free-trade principles. The other result was that I discovered from my experts that the Army got very little home-bred meat, that the meat they got came not from Ireland, or from anywhere at home, but from Australia, Canada, the Argentine and other countries, whence it was brought to the port of Liverpool, slaughtered there in very large quantities, and sold as home-bred meat. I have therefore the best evidence for believing that the change has not really been to the detriment of the constituencies of hon. members from Ireland; and at the same time we have saved £50,000 a year. That is only a simple illustration of the little reforms you can carry out. The Exchequer has a right to demand full value for the money it spends on the Army. Remember that the cost of the Regular soldier has risen from £49 3s. in the Estimates of 1896–7 to £66 18s. in the Estimates of 1906–7; £13 of that increase is due to additional pay. There has been a very large increase also in the cost of the Auxiliary Forces. The Militia, which in the ten years has fallen from 113,000 men to 90,000, costs £480,000 a year more. The Yeomanry has increased in numbers from 9,600 to 25,000, at an enhanced cost of £420,000 a year. The Yeomanry are a very useful and valuable force, but we must put to them the question—What service can you render us in time of war? The Volunteers have gone up in cost in the ten years to £6 10s. per man. To them likewise we have to put the question, What services can you render us in time of war? I am sure the Committee will pity the War Minister when he comes to deal with the financial side of the problem which faces him. There are automatic increases of expenditure of large amount arising out of things done in years past with which he has had nothing to do; and at the same time he is face to face with the duty of keeping down the Estimates. Still, it can be done, but in endeavouring to cope with that task I think he is entitled to ask for indulgence and consideration if he cannot accomplish everything as quickly as may be desired.

With these few preliminary observations, which I think are necessary to justify my position in regard to the Militia, I put to the force the question, What purpose do you fulfil in war at the present time? The Militia in old days were raised by ballot, which was compulsory— except in cases where the ballot was suspended—and were for service at home. Even if the ballot were made compulsory everywhere the Militia to-day would not be under any obligation to take part in operations beyond the seas; and if the force is to remain on that basis I could not conscientiously advise the Chancellor of the Exchequer to continue to spend upon them the money he is spending at the present time. The Militia must have a new function assigned to them in the organisation of the Army as a whole. They must either fall back into Volunteer work, in which case they would not be paid any more than the Volunteers are paid; or else they must take upon themselves the same obligation as the Regular soldier, and that is to be ready to serve abroad in time of war. In time of peace they stay at home. But in time of war they can be of no use to us unless they form an efficient first line of support to the Regular Army in the field. It is, therefore, clear that we must ask the Militia to form a first line of drafts for the Regular Army in the field, and therefore to accept the obligation of going abroad in time of war. There are two schools of thought with regard to the Militia. One, which is represented by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, says the Militiaman is but an imperfect conception of what a short-service soldier ought to be. Therefore, make him a real short-service soldier. The other school says what you should do with our old constitutional force is to extend them enormously, so that they shall be not merely a support to but an expansion of the Regular Army. This school looks to the Lords - Lieutenant to give a new life to the Militia. The Lords-Lieutenant cannot discharge that function. For such a purpose they are as dead as the dodo. I believe new life can be given to them, and that new functions may be assigned to them if they are surrounded by representatives of the more democratic and vigorous elements of the country, who may help them to discharge administrative duties connected with the Army. I do not propose, nor do we desire, to destroy the constitutional position of the Militia at the present time. You can keep them a county force and yet make a great step forward. Mr. Cardwell's great idea was, behind the two Regular battalions, the two territorialised battalions, to have a third Militia battalion. Behind that he wished to have depôt battalions which would be available on the outbreak of war, looked after by officers probably who were retired, but who would be called back on the outbreak of war. Into those depôt battalions all surplus elements could go, but between that and the second Regular battalion he desired to place the Militia battalion of the county. Well, the policy of the Government is to carry out Mr. Cardwell's principle, to make a closer connection between the Militia battalions and the Regular battalions than exists at present. The Militia have to elect between going into the condition of Volunteers and coming nearer to the Regular forces. What we are anxious to do is to take the Militia battalions and make them battalions of the Regular Army, to give its officers as nearly as possible Army rank, to place it in a better position as regards training, to raise its strength, and generally to make it much more efficient. We propose to take the 124 battalions of Militia we have now, to review them, to lop off weak battalions and to consolidate them, so as to make more efficient battalions, and to put behind every Regular battalion of the home Army a third or Militia battalion. In some cases there may be more than one Militia battalion, two, or even three, where the Militia are strong, which will put a first line of Reserve behind the Regular Army. The men will go abroad in units not lower than companies, and often in battalions, with their own officers, so that they may have the feeling that they are going out with their own officers to the regiments to which they are affiliated. I know there are many of the Militia who demur from that, and wish the force to be rather an extension than a reserve for the Army; but, on the other hand, the Army take very strongly the view that the average Militia battalion is not fit, and cannot be made fit, to be put into the field against the Regular troops of the Continent. It is felt that the first fighting line must be filled by the trained battalions of the Regular army. As the Militia become fit they can take the place of companies cut up in the Regular regiments to which they are affiliated. That will ensure the Regular Army taking an interest in their Militia battalions. Further than that we cannot go. It is impossible for this Government to spend money unless they can justify the expenditure. We hope gradually to get the Militia into shape. Valuable experiments have been made lately in Militia training, and we are making experiments ourselves which may lead to modifications in the mode of training the Militia, so as to make them better suited to the exigencies of different districts. It is upon that principle we propose to act. Of course that will be a gradual process, and we hope in that fashion to get the Militia into shape. Valuable experiments have been made lately in Militia training. We are making experiments which may lead to amplifications in the mode of training the Militia so that we may get hold of them more effectually and in a fashion that better suits the exigencies of different districts. The Militia Artillery must disappear as garrison artillery and in a new capacity be drawn nearer to the Regular field artillery.

Now I come to the Volunteers. The same question exactly we put to the Volunteers. We say, "What useful function do you fulfil — because you are costing the country £1,700,000 a year, money we do not grudge if you are fulfilling a necessary function." Now the Volunteers have definite functions which they ought to fulfil, and which to a large extent they do fulfil. If the nation went to war the Regular troops would go out of the garrison forts, which would then have to be defended by the Volunteers. The Volunteers are also required to repel possible raids to the extent of about 10,000 men. I think such raids very unlikely, because I believe the raiders would never go back alive. There may, however, be some Power which would be enterprising enough to lose 10,000 men in order to destroy the Elswick works or Woolwich Arsenal. They will find it very difficult, but still possible, and provision has to be made accordingly, and that is the second function which Volunteers have to fulfil. There is a third function which the Volunteers may have to fulfil, and that is to be a sort of second Reserve for the Regular Army. We propose to take the Volunteers and organise them for these three functions. For the first two—namely, the defence of the naval fortresses and the repelling of raids—it is estimated by the general staff that 140,000 infantry Volunteers, 9,000 garrison Volunteers, and 8,000 mounted men from the Yeomanry will be required. But at the present time everything is in a state of confusion. The Volunteers who have to defend the naval fortresses are often brought very great distances. The regions in which naval fortresses exist do not produce the kind of Volunteer who is wanted to defend them. We propose to survey the whole of Great Britain to determine the functions which the Volunteers should have to perform in each district and county, and to say to them, "What we requisition you for is this particular kind of service—you, men of Hampshire and the Southern counties, you have to defend the great southern Naval forts." In the Eastern counties there are unguarded portions of the coast, and we may say to the men in those districts, "You must produce in each district Volunteers of the type required for the defence of the coast." In other counties we may say, "We want you as infantry of the line or as mounted men." To other places we may say, "We should like you to take the field guns and train yourselves as a reserve of Volunteer artillery." In that way we hope to get value for our money out of the Volunteers. I have talked a good deal to Volunteer commanding officers on this very important subject and they have said to me, almost with one voice, "Do not have any hesitation in making this demand upon us. We Volunteers have been longing, for years past, to have real functions and to be freed from sham. Make one national Army, not regular and auxiliary forces, but one entire force." Speaking from such information as I have been able to get, I do not entertain much doubt that the Volunteers will respond to what we ask of them, and will say, "We are only too glad to find ourselves with real functions."

It will be observed that the working out of all this requires great care and minute local knowledge. How are you to get the Volunteers and the number of Militiamen required for these special services of which I have spoken? You cannot get them through the War Office. The War Office has broken down as a means of reorganising the Volunteers. The result is that battalions grow up haphazard. We must have county associations of some kind or sort. I start with the principle that unless you give some kind of Home Rule to the Volunteers you will not get efficient service.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) Will you allow us to raise Volunteers in Ireland?

Mr. HALDANE: I have that point on my note, and I will come to it, but I cannot do everything all at once. My hon. friend will remind me if I forget it.

We find that we are constantly maltreating the Volunteers for want of local knowledge, and we feel it to be absolutely essential that they should have some power of organisation in the counties and of controlling their own affairs. If that be so, it seems to us that the best way is to form some kind of association in the counties. It is rather an intricate subject, and I felt that it was a subject which opened up large questions indeed. You have to look not only at the question of the Volunteers, but also at the rifle ranges. It is easy to get rifle ranges if you have owners of land interested in the subject and who will give you rifle ranges because it is part of the organisation in which they are interested. Rifle ranges, rifle corps, cadet corps, and other things will come within the purview of the county association organised for the purpose of looking after the affairs of the Auxiliary Forces in each county. So impressed was I with the difficulty of the matter that I asked a committee to assemble, under the presidency of one who has already rendered great services to the Army by his work in reorganising it—I refer to Lord Esher. He has presided over a committee about which there have been all sorts of rumours. Indeed, it has enjoyed a greater reputation for mystery than any committee for a long time. But its procedure has been perfectly simple, and on the question of the county associations they have undertaken the laborious task of advising the War Office as to the best means of carrying this object out. Their present view is that you can do a great deal by bringing in a number of representatives of the new county and borough councils, representatives of the commanding officers of the Auxiliary Forces, and representatives of the general officer commanding the Regular troops in the district; and then there are the county people themselves. I should like to see a new life infused in our counties. I should like to see the county people getting something to do. I am making no reproach against them. Function after function has been taken from them, but there is now a new chance of their doing a great and useful work for the State. I should like to see the Lords-Lieutenant and perhaps the Deputy-Lieutenants earning their uniform. The Government is not committed to any details, but the Esher Committee is making recommendations, and still want to investigate the subject. The whole matter will be held over until the autumn, when proposals will be prepared which can come forward in the shape of Bills for next session. Meanwhile, some time must necessarily elapse, though for the purposes of administration as distinguished from command and training the Auxiliary Forces require Home Rule of this kind. Command and training must be inevitably under the control of persons who command the forces of the Crown.

I need only say that the Yeomanry form the cavalry of the territorial force, and we shall ask of them to furnish a detachment of the field force. We do not propose to increase by a penny the expenditure on the Auxiliary Forces, which has already grown to protentous dimensions, and I hope that there is room for economy. But we want to get out of the three or four millions spent on the Auxiliary Forces something very substantial in this form which will enable us to diminish the cost of the Regulars, something to bring the Army nearer to the people, to make the people more content with the Army than they are at the present time.

One word before I conclude this subject about the expansion of the Regular forces. This has been a subject of great discussion elsewhere. We may need expansion, but I do not believe that compulsion would be of the slightest avail for the purpose. I believe in the giving of local encouragement by every means in our power to the people, the giving to their associations an interest, not in aggression, not in the spirit of militarism, but in the defence of their homes, of their country, and of the Empire of which they form a part. Put within their hands the means of that defence, explain to the people what we want of them, and they will come to your side and you will not have much difficulty in getting the resources you require freely and generously offered to you. But for that purpose let them train themselves and organise themselves. It is, therefore, to my mind essential that they should be given the opportunity of organising themselves for possible war in a fashion that may lead rather to the expansion of quantity than the raising of a high quality in peace time. I should like to see every man interesting himself in possible contingencies and taking up military training, but not in such a fashion that he would be called upon to interfere with his business or set aside his engagements. If you leave our people alone, whether they belong to the working classes, the middle classes, or the upper classes, you will have a spirit shown among them which is perfectly ready of its own initiative to undertake in sufficient numbers the training that is necessary to make the art of war an art which is not unknown to them. So that if war broke out you give them an opportunity of training upon a higher scale and turning themselves into a reservoir out of which you can feed the Regular Army in time of need and also strengthen the defensive power of the Empire as a whole.

I now come to the end of my task. I have dealt very lightly with the latter portion of my subject. We are still in a state of consideration about the Auxiliary forces; but about the Regular Army and the Militia our principles and propositions are clear. About the things that remain, and which I have laid down in general principles, we are equally clear, though about them the Government reserves a considerable latitude for consideration. But I want to hear more from the Esher Committee about the problems they are considering, and I want the Auxiliary Forces to consider these things. Our scheme deals with a national Army as a whole. It is a linked chain, each link of which is necessary to the chain as a whole. To organise the National Army for war and not for show or sham, to put it on a business footing by bringing the civilian and the soldier into co-operation for a common purpose—that is our aim and object. We are under no illusion about the difficulty of the work. It may take a generation to realise this purpose, but I am certain that the way that is most likely to lead to its realisation is for the nation to agree on common principles and on a common policy. Here the agreement should be as harmonious and as complete as the policy which prevailed in respect of the Navy. We do not want one Government coming in to overturn the work of another. I would rather that the accomplishment of the great task took place by a process of evolution. No doubt the beginning is most difficult. I have to-day offered medicine to the patient which I fear may seem a bitter medicine when he takes it, but the recovery of his health, as well as of the health of the Army, can only come from a closer contact with the nation. The nation has had an extravagant, costly, standing force separate from the people. It ought to be rather that of the people themselves, the nation—yes, the Empire—because I believe our organisation fits in with the organisation of the English-speaking people of the Empire as a whole—the Empire organised, not for aggression, but for its own defence in cases of great emergency. These plans are the mere beginning. We hope to settle and work upon them without delay. The task is gigantic, and whether we shall succeed or whether we shall fail, we know not. The future will not disclose its secrets; but my colleagues and I believe that in these plans we have laid, with the assistance of our experts, the foundations of a structure which will largely diminish the cost of the Army while going hand in hand with greatly increased strength. Such a structure cannot be put together quickly. Perhaps a long time is necessary for its completion; but, if the plan be true, as we firmly believe it to be true, the completion of the edifice can be secured in the end. What is wanted for the completion of that edifice is the exercise and the output of an activity which must be unhasting as it is also unresting.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon) complimented the right hon. Gentleman on his extraordinarily clear and detailed speech. Earlier in the session he had assured the right hon. Gentleman that the Opposition would do nothing and say nothing to embarrass him in the difficult task he had undertaken; and he thought that the right hon. Gentleman would agree that this undertaking had been strictly observed. He was surprised, however, that the Prime Minister should ask the Committee to dispose of this complicated question at one sitting, especially in view of the fact that nineteen days were devoted to the question of the Army last year. He was sure he would be doing a grave injustice to the importance of the right hon. Gentleman's speech if he suggested that nineteen days would be too large an allowance of time for the proper discussion of the proposals which had just been laid before the Committee. He did not suppose there was any hon. Member of the House, not even among those who had made a special study of Army matters, who would attempt to deal with all the details of the scheme now. He rejoiced in the economy which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to effect, but he regretted the means by which it was to be brought about. If the right hon. Gentleman could say that the risks to which the country was exposed were less than they had been, then the time would have come to diminish the means of coping with those risks. But nothing that had been said in the House during the last few months had led them to form any idea of that kind. The right hon. Gentleman was going to compensate for the reduction in the Army by creating a new Army and a new organisation which was going to guarantee us against any loss which might come in consequence of that reduction. He was delighted to hear it, but he would suggest for the guidance of his hon. friends that it was better to be on with the new love before they were off with the old—that they had better make the new Army before they destroyed any part of the army which it was to replace. If they were going to make a new auxiliary army they had much better make it before they destroyed any part of the Regular Army of the country. He admitted that the reduction was not a large one, but there was an important omission in the right hon. Gentleman's speech. It was this. There had been an infinite number of discussions in public of the military problem, and there had not been a dissenting voice with regard to the proposition that the great need of the country was some power of expanding the Army in time of war. Not only had the right hon. Gentleman given no intelligible idea of how that expansion was to take place, but he had proved to demonstration that the power of expansion that we already possessed was to be gravely curtailed. When the South African war broke out in 1899 it was impossible to mobilise the infantry regiments from their own reserves. Under what system was that? That was under the seven years' system. Battalion after battalion went out short of their established figures, because they had to leave behind men who were unfit to go, and were unable to replace them from the reserves of the regiment. Now they were going to put the whole Army on a seven years' system of enlistment and concurrently to reduce the units by no less than ten. There were, however, some units in 1899 which were easily mobilised and had a large remaining force of Reserves. These were the regiments of the Brigade of Guards. The right hon. Gentleman said the Guards were expensive. But if they took the test of war they would find on putting 1,000 Guardsmen in the field that each man had cost £29, whereas each Linesman ready to take the field cost £46 6s. These two figures represented what the country got in fighting value for its expenditure upon the Guards and the rest of the Army respectively. Yet in the name of economy they were asked to accept a reduction in the Brigade of Guards. The Committee could not have a better object lesson as to the advantage of short service enlistment than the figures he had given. He thought it was a great misfortune that two battalions of the Guards had been singled out for destruction. He thought the reason given for this change was the weakest that could be given, namely, that under the present linked battalion system they could not give up the Line battalions, and that therefore they were compelled to sacrifice the Guards. It was, however, a much wider question than that of the Guards.

It was a question of the whole Army. How were we going to find a great force in time of war, such a force as would be required for the purposes of mobilisation, when we limited ourselves to seven years enlistment? The right hon. Gentleman was also going to cut down the Royal Artillery. If they cut down at all then should begin with the worst and not with the best; with the dearest and not with the cheapest. In the case of the Guards they were begining with the cheapest; and in beginning with them and with the Artillery they were also beginning with the best. The right hon. Gentleman had twitted him and his predecessor with want of knowledge with regard to the Royal Artillery and the need for providing it with a Reserve. He did not recognise the point of the taunt which the right hon. Gentleman had directed against him. It was perfectly true that the Royal Artillery had grown a great deal faster than their reserves, and the introduction of the new gun had increased the demand upon the *personnel* of the batteries. Ten years ago, moreover, public opinion compelled the addition of no less than seventy-eight batteries of horse and field Artillery. These batteries could not be raised in a hurry, and even now they had not got their full reserve. The Artillery was unable to mobilise on account of the inadequacy of the numbers for the ammunition train and the subsidiary services. During the late war, long before the mobilisation was complete, the whole of the *personnel* was exhausted for the purpose of forming ammunition trains and the adjuncts to the batteries. He had himself published the facts with regard to all the batteries in a book which appeared five years ago. It was hardly likely, therefore, that he should be unaware of the need. To remedy that defect had been the perpetual care of the War Office ever since; and with that object they had kept the three and nine years basis of enlistment for the Royal Artillery. That system would give a very large but still an inadequate Reserve. But the moment they put the Artillery upon a six years' basis they would greatly aggravate the difficulty.

Arrangements were made by the late Government which the right hon. Gentleman had for the moment suspended for obtaining a most valuable reinforcement for the Artillery from the Volunteers. The officers commanding two of the most important Volunteer Artillery Corps had actually offered to make it a condition of entry that their men should join the First Class Army Reserve and thus be available for the ammunition columns, etc. He had himself for years preached the doctrine of utilising the Garrison Militia to supplement the Royal Artillery, and his proposals, which were carefully worked out, and contemplated beginning with the north of Ireland batteries, had no doubt been found at the War Office by the right hon. Gentleman. No doubt large use might be made of the Militia; the right hon. Gentleman had said that he hoped that they would be able to amalgamate the Militia Artillery with the Royal Artillery in times of war; but in suggesting this, the right hon. Gentleman had not touched the great Militia problem. He must have a Militia before he could utilise it. He admitted that it was dying, but he had not said how he proposed to keep it alive. By what conjuring trick was he going to get men instead of boys to go into the Militia, and how was he going to prevent these boys from going into the Regular Army without injuring recruiting for the Army? Was he quite confident that this Militia artillery would agree to undertake in war work which was absolutely different from that which they had undertaken in time of peace? Unless the Militia was really capable of being utilised in time of war the scheme failed absolutely. But how was it to be done?

The savings indicated by the right hon. Gentleman were much less important than the answer to the question, "Where is the great force for expanding the Army in time of war to come from?" The Militia was not producing trained men or trained officers, and all this paraphernalia of county councils and the like would not do what the people of all other countries found they could do only by the sacrifice of time, effort, and money. He would remind the Committee that in 1904 35,000 men entered the Militia and 38,000 went out of it. Of the 35,000 recruits 22,000 deserted or went into the Line, and 12,000 were under eighteen years of age, and, therefore, ineligible for the Line. Out of the Militia as it stood it was impossible to form a fighting force capable of reinforcing the Army in time of war, and therefore the Militia part of the scheme failed. The right hon. Gentleman had been very sketchy as to the shadowy Army which he was to evolve, and the proposals should be cautiously supported until it was known what they were. He hoped that no new soldiers would be accepted unless they were, at least, the numerical and fighting equivalent of the soldiers whom they displaced. Both the Militia and the Volunteers contained valuable material, but it was well known that the officers of both forces were not efficiently trained. It should be a *sine qua non* of the acceptability of this scheme that no single man should be taken from the Militia or Volunteers unless it could be proved that he would be better trained and commanded by better officers than at present.

The right hon. Gentleman had not made a single allusion to the over-whelmingly important question of officers. It could not be a matter of forgetfulness. If he had a plan for finding 2,000 or 3,000 trained officers, where was it? The right hon. Gentleman hoped to make a great change in the Volunteers; and if he could adopt the force in each county to the military need of that county, he would have achieved a great triumph; but he had not said how he would proceed. A little time ago the right hon. Gentleman quoted in support of his theories what happened in France. It was strange that the Secretary of State speaking on his official responsibility, should, in order to enforce a great change in our Army organisation, choose the particular example of General Chanzy's citizen army. That was the great historical example of the breakdown of an ill-trained and ill-officered force. Prince Frederick Charles reported that he had captured in ten days 20,000 unwounded prisoners, many guns, all their ammunition wagons, and all their positions; and General Chanzy said that they fled at the first shot, and could not be induced to defend any position, simply because they were not properly trained and officered. Nowadays the waste of war was enormous—the right hon. Gentleman had put it at 80 per cent. How was the wastage to be replaced? They should be able to apply the same test that the right hon. Gentleman had applied, and they also would ask "What will be the value of these things in war?" What did this whole series of proposals come down to? We were to have 150,000 men of whom 30,000 were to be irregulars, Militia and so forth. The right hon. Gentleman himself had given some idea of the figures in regard to waste of war, and they had a terrible significance. The waste of war might be 50, 60, or 70 per cent. every year; the right hon. Gentleman himself had given the figure at 80 per cent. How were we going to replace that force in the field, especially as we had to deal with this large number of persons who did not belong to the Regular force? The right hon. Gentleman seemed to have the idea that he was going to take into the force a large number of persons under a short engagement, but there was nothing novel in that. It had been the practice for years, especially in regard to the Army Medical Department, the Post Office and the Army Service Corps. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken in great detail about the Royal Artillery, which he proposed to reduce by 3,800 men, but his proposals required very careful examination, and there should be further explanation of his method of making up the number of trained artillerists from the ammunition column. France, the right hon. Gentleman had said, had reduced her number of guns. That was an entire delusion. What she had done was to increase the number of her infantry. Did the right hon. Gentleman when he reduced the guns, propose to add to the infantry?

*MR. **HALDANE**: They have reduced the number of guns in the battery.

*MR. **ARNOLD-FORSTER** said that was so, but the matter was considered by the War Office, and it was asked whether we should do the same. France, he repeated, had recently added to the number of their infantry. Let that be as it might, however, they at this point came to a very specious statement which had been made and to which he asked the Committee to pay attention. He did not ask them to hear his eloquence but to listen to his facts, and for this latter proposal he regretted that the Committee was not fuller than it was at that moment. Many hon. Members having heard the statement of the Minister for War had left the House, no doubt under the impression produced by that statement that we were well provided with artillery.

*MR. **HALDANE**: We are not just now.

*MR. **ARNOLD-FORSTER** said that was so. The right hon. Gentleman told the Committee that there would be five guns to every 1,000 men, but the Indian Army had no provision of field artillery, and there were something like 340,000 men at home absolutely unprovided with artillery. Yet he said the value of artillery was becoming more and more recognised. A certain number of guns were going to be given to the Volunteers, but the Secretary of State declared that these 15-pounders could not be made part of the equipment of an efficient fighting force. When the men were taken away to some other body to serve under totally different conditions the Auxiliary Forces would be left exactly where they were. It was with surprise he heard the right hon. Gentleman say that he had the authority of his military advisers for the reduction of the units of the Royal Artillery. Every trained man was required for the Artillery.

The right hon. Gentleman had gone into much detail not at all relevant to the organisation of the Army, and it was to be hoped he would on a future occasion explain why instead of reducing strength, he was destroying units. He might get his drafts with the greatest ease if he would dispense with the unfortunate linked battalion system. Any reduction at the present time which was not accompanied by the replacing of what was taken away by something just as good was a mistake. When the right hon. Gentleman had time to answer the questions he would ask for a little more detailed information in regard to the great go-as-you-please Army of which they had heard. He wanted also to know how the Militia was to be kept out of the Line. The right hon. Gentleman had told the Committee that the Line was bleeding the Militia, and he wanted to know how the right hon. Gentleman was going to stop the bleeding, and how the Army itself was going to live if the life blood of the Militia no longer passed into its veins. Who were to be the officers of the county council Army, what authority would they possess? What training were they to receive, and were the men for this new Army to be taken from the Militia or the Volunteers, or from both? The right hon. Gentleman might stamp his foot and command a new host to come forth, but it would not come. Everyone knew that he would only get the same Army again. He would like the right hon. Gentleman to tell the Committee which he was going to destroy, the Militia or the Volunteers. He wanted some better reason for the changes he proposed than had yet been given. It was all very well to say that the great question of disarmament should be placed before everything else, but he thought the right hon. Gentleman said a very dangerous thing when he said we were going to take the lead. Was it wise on our part—we, the smallest military force in the world—to set that example when there were so many more powerful countries with much more to gain by such an agreement ? We could not play at soldiering. Training, sacrifice, and effort were the price of victory in war. The soldiers of Japan were trained under their officers for three years, and French and German soldiers were trained under their officers for two years. Did the right hon. Gentleman suppose that, if we put into the field officers who had never been trained, to lead men who had never been trained, we should escape the penalties that other nations who had made that mistake had had to pay ?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he was well aware that in spite of the long and interesting speech of his right hon. friend, even now the Committee were not in the possession of many facts which were absolutely material to any judgment of the proposals which he had put before the House. The right hon. Member for Croydon in his speech pointed out one or two deficiencies in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman and those deficiencies might easily be supplemented by questions which would show hon. Members who were interested in this subject how little they really knew of the proposals of the Secretary of State—too little to form a judgment upon them. It seemed essential in any case that, if business at the present period of the session prevented the possibility of a debate now, before the Estimates were put into their final shape and before any of the suggestions which had been adumbrated by the right hon. Gentleman were acted upon, they should have some further opportunity of debating this question. It would be worth it even if the opportunity took the form of repealing the only Resolution on the books of this House, namely, the Brodrick proposals. Since the Cardwell scheme the House of Commons had never given any other judgment on the military affairs of the country. Upon this occasion the Secretary of State had told the Committee that Bills would be required for the creation of the territorial Army on the county system that was at present in the air. The right hon. Gentleman had told them nothing to-day to enable them to pass a judgment upon his proposals. They might express doubts, but they could not pass judgment on his scheme to-day. It might be a long way off. It was quite possible that the new Esher Committee might be less near complete agreement than was currently reported, and that by October next complete agreement might not have been reached. In that case it was most important that they should have a pledge from the right hon. Gentleman that the Committee should have an opportunity of discussing the subject which was not the subject of a Bill. Another question raised on the last words of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman was one of the most interesting, but he did not think they ought to pursue all the questions that might arise in debate, and he should hesitate to pursue the question on this occasion, except to say that the truth in his opinion lay between the two sides. He agreed absolutely with the last speaker that the trained force was the essential force. But the whole question depended on whether it was necessary that we should tie ourselves to the old tradition that governed the scheme before the Committee; or whether it was not possible to work out a plan in the circumstances of the country to substitute for the Regular Army of long-service highly-trained men at home, an Army in which the rank and file would be composed of men raised in part from the Militia and in part from the Volunteers. The Secretary of State had gone on the old plan because he had the seventy-one battalions at home tied round his neck, and he could not otherwise get a sufficiently large Reserve for this purpose. The right hon. Gentleman came down to the House with this great speech, but he (Sir Charles Dilke) found in his scheme very little saving of money and no permanent saving. The men could be put back in a moment of panic. They had seen considerable increases of battalions at different times. The men were not always raised, but the money was raised. And the men the right hon. Gentleman was cutting off were not there. They had not been raised; the recruiting had not given the entire number of men. We had an empire of the seas, and our enmity was feared and our alliance was sought after by other Powers on account of our position and naval strength. Whether the Navy could be decreased was a detail as compared with this main fact. He, like many others, had supported the proposals which the Board of Admiralty had made from time to time, but if they had differed at all upon policy it was that of three or four years ahead rather than that of the actual moment, and they had always been united in the desire to retain that naval pre-eminence upon which our position in the world in a military sense depended. Our Army was secondary, except so far as India went. No one had admitted that more frankly than the late Prime Minister. That being so, how did the respective finance in regard to the Army and the Navy stand? The expenditure on Army and Navy together was vastly larger than people commonly supposed, because they forgot the expenditure of India and that included in the Civil Service Estimates and on loan money. They compared things which were not comparable, because the loan money and the Estimates varied from year to year. The expenditure of the Empire upon its Navy when it reached its highest figure in the Estimates of 1904–5, was over £42,000,000 sterling. It had fallen, through the efforts of the late Government, by £9,500,000 a year. On the Army there had been no such decrease, and while at the topmost point the Empire was perhaps spending upon the Army £60,000,000 a year, in the present year the expenditure would not be less than £58,000,000, or £2,000,000 less, as against a decrease of £9,500,000 in the Navy. That looked wrong on the face of it, and it made a case for one of those large reductions in land military expenditure which could not be accomplished by any of the parings of his right hon. friend. It could only be accomplished by a complete change of military system, and those who had advocated sweeping reforms for years past had always stated there was no room for large economy on the present system. If they required large economy on the land forces they must be prepared to secure it by separating the Indian Army from the Home Army. The Indian Government had said over and over again that the present linked battalion system did not suit India, and that they would undertake the training of their own men in their own depots here, and produce a better article at a lower price. His right hon. friend did not point as regarded Infantry to cheaper cost, but he did as regarded Artillery. Why was it not applicable to the Infantry also? The Secretary of State for War had explained on a previous occasion to those who had not followed this question closely what cadres meant. They meant something in which the recruits were trained in time of peace, and into which were put the reservists in time of war. His right hon. friend supplemented the Regular force as regarded the artillery by bringing in a large Militia, or semi-Militia element, but as regarded the Infantry he looked forward to a system of which they had not yet grasped the plan, which would take Militia battalions, as they understood them, either as whole battalions or as separate companies attached to the Regular forces in the field. That was a plan wholly different from that which the Secretary of State proposed with regard to artillery. His right hon. friend returned to a uniform system of seven years with the colours and five years with the reserve. That system, which was here called a short-service system, was by far the longest system in the world, and, therefore, by far the most costly. It was that which led to the curious fact that Guards were cheap, although there was a difference of opinion between the two right hon. Gentlemen as to the cost of the Guardsman as compared with the Linesman. The right hon. Gentleman opposite said the cost was half and the Secretary of State for War said it was the same. It was the Guardsmen who of the Infantry uniformly behaved well in the South African War. He was favourable to his right hon. friend's proposals on the whole with regard to the artillery, and he did not oppose his proposals with regard to the Guards, but it was a curious fact that the two forces, the reduction of which had been discussed to-day, were the two forces which, by universal admission, maintained the highest traditions of the British Army in South Africa. The conduct of the artillery as a force was uniformly magnificent, and the Guards, though perhaps less brilliant than the artillery, did their work without any of those humiliating surrenders by which the course of almost every other branch was marked. His right hon. friend to-day, in talking of his scheme under these new terms of service, spoke of the Cardwell system as being six years. That was not the case except in India. He had told his right hon. friend and the War Office so before. It was a question of fact, as could be confirmed by *Hansard*. Mr. Cardwell's declaration on February 16th, 1871, was that he was going to continue to try the four years system, and that he hoped to reduce it to three, except in the case of India, where it was six years with the colours and six years with the reserve. Mr. Cardwell's declaration was that the service of the Regular infantry should be as short as would make an efficient soldier, and that was the principle they maintained now, and it was the true Cardwell system. On the whole the system which existed at present and the system which was proposed by his right hon. friend both yielded an average actual service longer even than the service before the time of Mr. Cardwell, and in this scheme they seemed to have got rid of almost every vestige of short service. It was a long service army which his right hon. friend created, and was, therefore, a step away from the modern ideas and from the uniform experience of every other nation in Europe. It was saddling the country for ever with a system of which the very essence was that, while it might give a very excellent article, it must give a very costly one. His right hon. friend had said in the strongest terms that the force abroad determined the minimum force at home. The principle was that our force at home was not determined by our needs, our policy, or our desire, but absolutely and for ever because we felt ourselves bound to keep at home the same number of costly Regular infantry battalions which the circumstances of the Empire forced us to keep abroad. That was the linked-battalion system. His right hon. friend had said that these seventy-one battalions, which he admitted were very costly, were here by no fault of the authorities. They were here by the fault of a system which was out of date and out of harmony with every other country and necessarily costly in the extreme, and which must prevent large reductions of the force ever being accomplished. The short tour system was the subject of much ridicule when it was invented. The Minister for War had admitted that Malta was an unhealthy station, and yet under the short tour system we were obliged to send the young recruits thither, where they could not be properly trained, and to this we were condemned by the present cast-iron system. Those were the results of the link-battalion system which we had tied round our necks. With regard to the artillery, the Secretary for War had announced a new departure, but for the infantry he had remained the oldest of old-fashioned reactionaries, if he would allow him to say so. He could not pledge himself to detail in regard to the artillery scheme. He agreed with what had been said by the late Secretary of State for War as to our weakness in field artillery as compared with other Powers and as compared with the enormous force they possessed numbering over 1,000,000 men. In proportion to that total we were very imperfectly supplied with field artillery. It should not be forgotten that if we were looking forward to bringing a larger force into the field we could not do so effectively without those highly trained services of artillery and cavalry. That was a doctrine common to all. He thought there had been a little juggling in regard to the figures quoted referring to the French artillery. The French were behind the Germans in the number of recruits they could take and in the number of men they could keep in arms. They were also behind them in the number of men they could put into the field in the event of war, but, nevertheless, they had kept pace with Germany in regard to artillery gun for gun in spite of their inferiority of numbers. The same argument applied to the cavalry in France. He thought that demolished any argument based upon French experience, because the French had not diminished their artillery, but on the contrary they had made great sacrifices to keep it up to its present standard. On the other hand no one depreciated the value of the special field artillery raised upon the Militia system, and he believed it to be an admirable artillery. Many years ago Colonel Birley of Manchester wrote a pamphlet in which he recommended a mixed system of artillery and many of them advocated it. It consisted partly of Regulars and partly of Militia or Volunteers, and the experiment had been tried. For the past four or five years the Army Estimates had contained nine batteries of artillery, three of which had been raised in Lancashire upon this mixed system. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman was going to try not the Lancashire system, but a new system, and from what he had heard it was one which would have his support. It was an experiment in the direction which the late Secretary of State for War would like to see tried. What he felt sure the Committee would be anxious to know was what step was going to be taken to avoid the hiatus between the old system and the new, and how far it was it going to diminish the number of trained field artillerymen or diminish what was more important—the number of trained artillery horses which we possessed at present. They would like to know how far the right hon. Gentleman was going to slacken his efforts before his new experiment became operative. Upon that point he thought there would be a natural anxiety in all parts of the House. It should not be overlooked that changes were taking place in this country which would prevent our obtaining that valuable class of reserve horses which we had been getting hitherto, and on this account it was all the more necessary that we should not reduce our trained horses. The Secretary of State for War had spoken of a great expeditionary force of 160,000 men. If that was the force which the Government thought necessary he thought that the number of horses should be exactly in proportion to the trained force. Personally he had never been one of those who desired to see kept up a large force of Regular infantry at home for expeditionary purposes. He had always wished to see a large force of Regular artillery and cavalry and mounted men kept up, and he thought that view had the support of and was recommended by the Elgin Commission. Whatever the size of the striking force was placed at, the permanent and costly element in it requiring training should be at the highest point of efficiency. Whatever the force was, having regard to the desire to reinforce it by the territorial army, it should be highly equipped with the professional elements, because we could not improvise such elements as cavalry, mounted infantry, or artillery. He was very anxious about this matter, and also in regard to any hiatus which might occur between the old and the new systems. With regard to the Yeomanry he wished to point out that he took no part in what was very much fought over some time ago. At that time the Yeomanry officers in this House were very much excited about the matter, and they tried to force the late Government to abandon the intention of having two kinds of men in the Yeomanry — one kind who would and another who would not go abroad in time of war. That now seemed to him to be the proposal of the Secretary for War. He took no part in that struggle at the time, but he remembered the excitement that was created and how they were told that the system would ruin the Yeomanry. There was a similar proposal with regard to the Militia. The right hon. Gentleman had said he agreed with the Militia in the dislike they had to having their men picked out for the Militia reserve, and that system had been abolished. He would like to know if the Militia agreed to the proposal by which certain companies were to be specially prepared for foreign service. Then there remained the question put by the late Secretary of State for War as to how we were going to equip the Militia and bring them up to the standard which they were to attain to for that part of the system suggested by the right hon. Gentleman. These were questions upon which he thought the Committee had a right to ask, if not to insist, upon having an answer, before the matter was finally decided. There was another matter that was still in the air, and that was the territorial Army of the future. He had no doubt from the language used by the Secretary of State for War at an earlier period of the session that he expected to meet his critics with regard to the territorial Army scheme, and they pressed him on May 24th to lay before the House of Commons the statement which he had made before the Committee which dealt with questions of the future. He thought the House of Commons had a full right to information upon that point as well as the members of that Committee. The House of Commons was quite as competent to deal with those matters as the Committee, because they knew the counties of the country thoroughly and they knew all about the Volunteers and rifle clubs. Therefore the House ought to be consulted by the Government in the preparation of any territorial Army scheme. They would probably be told that the scheme was only in the air and that the Committee were engaged in considering a scheme which had been submitted to them, but when a sort of arrangement had been come to there was always a tendency to force it down the mouth of the House of Commons, but in his opinion upon such a matter the House of Commons ought to be consulted first. It was admitted that during the war the counties rendered much assistance in South Africa, and no doubt they would be ready to do it again if the emergency arose. It was admitted that the county organisations were admirable in war, and in the provision of rifle ranges the assistance of the counties would also be most valuable. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to have in his mind the unfortunate resistance of country gentlemen to manœuvres, but he thought that resistance might be broken down by county organisation. As regarded the administration of the force, strong language had been used in the House of Lords by Lord Portsmouth who seemed to suggest that the recruiting and training of the force ought to be handed over to the county bodies. No doubt the words used by the Secretary for War were intended to correct a mistaken impression which had been given by Lord Portsmouth's speech. He thought the administration of the new Army county by county would be a disaster both in a financial and in a military sense. But before any step in that sense was taken, which must have the effect of removing the financial control of a large portion of the Army from the House of Commons, he hoped the House would be consulted and would become a party to any arrangement which might be made. The Lords-Lieutenant were spoken of in the original scheme, but they had been let down rather easily by his right hon. friend to-day. No doubt it was odious to select examples, but he might mention two. He lived in Surrey and represented Gloucestershire. He doubted whether Conservatives would be prepared to commit the military affairs of these counties to the Lords-Lieutenant. Lords-Lieutenant did not command implicit confidence on the other side of the House, and on the Ministerial side they did not command any confidence at all. It had been said that it was necessary to have their patronage because they were the great people in the counties. The Liberal Party would not be inclined to put forward Lords-Lieutenant in any scheme. He believed that in this scheme there had been a suggestion made that grants of public money should be handed over to the county committees in order that they might undertake the administration of the new territorial Army. Against that on principle he unhesitatingly protested in the name of soldiering and in the name of the finance of the Army. It would never be economical in the long run. It was contrary to all sound principles of administration. It would take the territorial Army from the financial control of this House and of the Treasury. He had the strongest opinion on that point, and he expressed it all the more freely because he believed there was nothing settled with regard to it. But for heaven's sake before it was settled he hoped they would be able to express their views in the House of Commons. Let them have an assurance to-night that they would know about the new territorial Army and that they would be able to discuss it in all its details. As far as he understood, there were to be two classes of Volunteers. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the part the Volunteers were to play in the defence of Portsmouth, Plymouth, and Woolwich. Those who were to be efficient for war were to play their part in resisting raids. The right hon.

Gentleman had mentioned the number of men, foot and Yeomanry, who were to take part in these operations in the event of mobilisation. What of the others? This question was a matter on which the House of Commons ought to be consulted. It was a matter on which he believed there would be the greatest difference of opinion. Many Volunteer officers and those who had looked forward to either the Militia or the Volunteers, or both, or a force between these two on the Australian or the Canadian footing, as the home Army of the future, must feel that it was a reactionary step to contemplate the turning of a larger body of the Volunteers into a body called a territorial Army, but in fact no army at all. It would have no training and nothing except the feeble county organisation. The questions asked to-night were questions which ought to be asked, and most of them demanded that an opportunity should be given for their discussion on a future occasion. He was convinced that the plan which had been laid before the Committee was not one which ought to be adopted hastily on this occasion. His suspicions of the territorial Army were increased by the notorious fact that it was "all things to all men." It had been represented to the pure economists in this House as being a great security for economy in the future. They were told that this large territorial Army of the future would be a cheap army. That was what was said to the economists. On the other hand, it was supported by some men with strong military or alarmist views who believed in the necessity of sending 500,000 men to India for the defence of India, a circumstance which, in his opinion, would never arise. These two views of this Army could not both be correct. They were as wide as the poles asunder. Probably both were wrong, but the extreme vagueness of the proposal made it the more essential that this House should keep control of it both in the present and in the future.

MR. GUY BARING (Winchester) said the appreciation of the scheme described by the Secretary of State for War which had just been given by so high an authority as the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean would perhaps convey to the right hon. Gentleman the unpopularity of his proposals. The right hon. Gentleman had justified his scheme on three grounds. With that which had reference to the linked battalion system he quite agreed. He could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman's reason in regard to the reduction of the Brigade of Guards. The right hon. Gentleman did not quote the Army Council when he made that statement. He quoted a nameless general, but he could not have consulted the Army Council or Sir John French. Thirdly, these two battalions were ruled out because the right hon. Gentleman had a settled figure of 50,000 Regular soldiers who were to form the force to go abroad if required. He could not see what virtue the right hon. Gentleman found in 50,000. That was a perfectly arbitrary figure. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had not been quite fair to the brigade in this way. He had gone round the Army and asked everybody to show justification for their existence, and also what efficiency they could show for war. He might have told the Committee what other troops could do, what this brigade could do, if called upon for war. The right hon. Gentleman would agree with him that the Guards could put three battalions in the field on a war footing, leaving between 600 and 1,000 men behind as reserves. That was an asset of the greatest value, and one which they could not lightly put aside. He spoke as an interested person in this matter, for he had had the honour of serving thirteen years in the Guards. He had seen all the trouble that had been taken in working these battalions up to the pitch to which they had been brought. He had heard with the greatest regret the right hon. Gentleman's announcement that he was going to do away with some of the battalions. He wished to put what he admitted was a minor point before the Committee, namely, the point of view of those who were going to suffer by the change. He had reason to believe that the right hon. Gentleman was most sympathetic. He had asked the Committee to give him time to carry out the scheme. The time which the Committee would grant really made no practical difference. They must realise that the carrying out of the proposals would entail a great deal of hardship on the officers, non-commissioned officers, and men concerned. This applied all the more to the battalions of the brigade than to the battalions of the line. The officers, non-commissioned officers and men joined under special enlistment, and there was practically no similar battalion that they could adopt. He understood that the colonel of the Grenadier Guards was willing to take any recommended officers in any of the battalions which were going to be dismissed. At any rate, it could but be a very slow process of absorption, and the result would be that a certain number of men would have their life's work thrown away. He really did not see how the right hon. Gentleman was going to get over the difficulty. It was to be hoped that he had some further plan to indicate. He himself thought that the only plan was not to dismiss the battalions at all.

*Sir J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham) said the Secretary of State for War had in his long and eloquent speech indicated substantial reductions in all branches of the Army. He thought everyone on the Ministerial side of the House would regard the proposed reductions with sincere approval. He thought that even the eager spirits who had spoken on this subject at the commencement of the session would not have cause to complain of the reductions which were now to be made without undue delay. He was amongst those who in this House had for many years advocated a reduction in the *personnel* of the Army. He believed, as other hon. Members had done, that the present establishment of the Army was unnecessarily large, and that the consequence was a most wasteful condition of things. He had always held the view now common amongst all sections of the House that we must carry out a policy by which we could husband our resources in time of peace and expand them in time of war. He had been long enough in the House to know that schemes for Army reform must be accepted with a considerable amount of precaution. The Minister for War had told the Committee that he proposed a large reduction of the men in the regular Army. Many hon. Members had always had the firm conviction that the only real reduction in Army expenditure that could be effected was by a reduction of men. It was true that many economies could be effected in various directions, and he was glad to note that his right hon. friend intended to enforce rigorously economies which cumulatively would secure a large saving in expenditure and at the same time add to efficiency. But permanent economy in the expenditure on the Army could only be effected by the reduction of the regular forces of the Crown. The question then arose whether if the infantry of the Line were reduced it would be consistent with the military efficiency of the country and the protection of the Empire. The expenditure on the Army of late years had reached an enormous sum—a much larger sum than many would have believed possible a decade ago. Within the last few years it amounted to £60,000,000, of which £21,000,000 was devoted to the defence of India. Then there had to be added £35,000,000 of expenditure on the Navy, which, taken together, was a prodigious sum for the defensive forces of the Empire, and largely in excess of the sums paid by foreign nations for their defence. If any one looked at those large figures and took a broad view of the case he must arrive at the conclusion that there were very substantial reasons for the reduction of the expenditure on our defensive forces. The only question was in what way the reduction could be brought about. There were only two ways—one comparatively easy and the other difficult. The Secretary of State for War had taken the easy way. He had said he would knock off a certain number of battalions from the existing establishment but that he would not disturb the existing organisation. But it would not be possible to effect any real or permanent reduction of the infantry o the line so long as the existing system obtained. He did not gather whether there was to be a reduction of two battalions of the Guards or whether one battalion was to be sent to Egypt.

*Mr. HALDANE: There are to be two battalions extinguished.

*Sir J. DICKSON-POYNDER thought it would be impossible to make any material reduction in the Army, if in the days to come they were to maintain one line battalion at home to provide for the wastages of the battalion on a foreign station. The linked battalion system was the obstacle to any real reduction of the military forces of the country. The modern "blue water" school laid it down that we should have an Army for foreign service; that there was no necessity for a large Regular Army for home defence and that home defence must be left in the main to the Navy. As he understood it, the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman did not, by any means, carry out the premises stated by his right hon. friend, because far from there being a small Army at home for draft purposes for foreign service, we should have a larger Army at home consisting of 150,000 men. The question, therefore, arose whether that Army of 150,000 was necessary cr the purpose stated. It had been scientifically laid down that in every battalion at home there should be 125 men ready to supply drafts for the battalion abroad. The number of men abroad—in India and the Colonies—was 90,000, and on that basis it would be found that 16,000 would be sufficient to maintain a continuous stream of drafts for the regiments abroad. But under the linked battalion system not 16,000 but 71,000 men would be maintained to furnish the drafts. He did not suggest that there need be any serious diminution in the cadres which would involve a diminution in the number of officers, but he believed that by the depôt system being introduced, the supply of drafts for abroad would be efficiently established. He asked his right hon. friend whether he could not see his way to abandon the linked-battalion system. If the right hon. Gentleman did so he would find himself in a position to maintain full efficiency at home and a full stream of drafts for abroad with a great reduction of the Regular infantry in this country. He should like to say one word as to the proposal which his right hon. friend outlined as to the territorial Army. He had advocated in this House a policy on the same lines for many years, because he believed that if we were to have a large and efficient Army, there should be a territorial Army in close touch with those who lived in the counties. He quite agreed with the caustic remarks of the right hon. baronet about Lords-Lieutenant. He had been brought up to look with respect upon Lords-Lieutenant, but he did not think that they were the proper representatives of the county to take over the administration of the territorial Army. We wanted for that purpose a body which was in close touch with the democratic sentiment of the county. He hoped that upon that body would be placed the Members of Parliament for the district, because they were brought into close touch with the people in large areas in their counties. They would have intimate association with the sentiment of the county, and would form a nucleus upon which the military government of the county could be built up. He quite agreed with what the right hon. Baronet had said as to the powers which these committees should have, and he did not think that they would be the proper bodies to have the military handling of our Auxiliary Forces. There were, however, many duties which they could perform by which they could improve the territorial Army. They could do a great deal in regard to recruiting, as they were in close touch with many classes of the community who had heretofore kept aloof from the Army. They also might do much in regard to giving access to land for the purpose of manœuvres and rifle ranges, upon which the efficiency of our Auxiliary Forces so largely depended. One more duty which they might usefully perform was that of finding employment for soldiers after they had left the ranks. There always had been this difficulty about the man who joined the Army, which was felt, perhaps, more by his parents than by himself, that when he left it he was thrown upon the casual labour market to make the best he could of his new conditions. To take steps in this direction would tend to raise the standard of the recruit, and measures should be taken to ensure that when he left the Army he should have some employment which would keep him for the rest of his life. He could not conceive any body better suited to perform such a duty than the body which had been suggested. Many men when they left the Army desired to return to their native county, and if their services could be utilised it would be very desirable. Such a body might bring themselves into close association with the local authorities and industrial organisations, such as railway companies and those who employed a large amount of labour. In conclusion, he would content himself with saying that while he looked cautiously upon this scheme he welcomed the promise of reduction, although he regretted that it took the form of being wedded to the linked battalion system. He regretted that his right hon. friend had not seen his way in that respect to a complete reorganisation of our Army system. The whole scheme was, however, so elaborate and complicated that before it was put into operation a full opportunity for discussion and consideration should be afforded.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) said he had listened to the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman with disappointment and apprehension, and he appealed to him to pause and reconsider the position he had taken up. From the time the right hon. Gentleman spoke at the beginning of the session Members on the Opposition side had regarded him as one of the few bright sparks of the Liberal Administration. It was true that in that speech they had nothing to go on, but they had every reason to believe that he was desirous of promoting the best interests of the Army, that he had the courage of his opinions, that no Party influence would weigh with him, and that the complex question of the Army could not be placed in better hands. They were also led to believe that as he was new to his office he would weigh carefully every consideration, that he was fully alive to his responsibilities, and above all that no scheme would be evolved until some time had elapsed in which it could be conclusively proved that the scheme before being produced had matured to its fullest extent. All these hopes had been disappointed. The right hon. Gentleman had almost obtained their confidence under false pretences, and they had been labouring under a misapprehension as to the intent and purposes of the War Office. The scheme of the right hon. Gentleman had descended into their midst like a bolt from the blue. Whether the right hon. Gentleman felt that in the midst of the educational strife he had been left out in the cold and desired with the fighting instinct which was indigenous to his race to return to the fray, or whether the scheme was the result of a normal period of production he (Lord Castlereagh) was at a loss to discover. He had no desire to impugn the motives of the right hon. Gentleman, but his scheme was not calculated to benefit the country. It was not economical and would, if carried into effect, do a lasting injury to many who deserved better at the hands of a grateful country. He gave place to no one in his desire to see far-reaching economies effected, but there were limits of economy, and a rich and prosperous country must mean heavy liabilities, and amongst those liabilities was the maintenance of an efficient Army capable of contraction in time of peace and expansion in time of war. The Army was sustaining a heavy loss by the reduction of so many units. He was of opinion that these units constituted an insurance of the country in peace and that they removed those difficulties of organisation which were so apparent in the South African War. During that dark period it was obvious that our peace organisation was not adequate for producing a large number of men at a moment's notice. Were we to return to that state of affairs after a warning so emphatic as the lessons of the South African War had given us? He understood that it was contemplated to convert a certain number of batteries of artillery into Militia artillery. Were they to assume that the Army was so well equipped with artillery that we could afford to make such alterations in so important a branch of the service? He would not say a word against the Militia. He was an enthusiastic supporter of it, but he maintained that it was absolutely impossible, in the short time the Militia had at its disposal, for that force to arrive at that standard of efficiency which was absolutely necessary for the soldier belonging to a branch of the Regular Army. The Liberal Government claimed that they had a mandate to effect great economies, but he maintained that that was a mandate to every Government in power, and he urged the right hon. Gentleman to consider whether his proposed reductions were real and lasting economies. It was certain that the life of the Government would not be of long duration. Notwithstanding the admirable policy of the Foreign Minister it was possible that they might be plunged into difficulties abroad, and would it be any consolation to hon. Members opposite, when the present Administration had vanished, to know that although the Government had effected economies the next Unionist Government would be called on to expend all the money saved and a good deal more in order adequately to cope with the difficulties which might at any moment beset us? To cope with these difficulties adequately it was necessary to have behind the Government of the country an efficient force to enforce their claims. These were considerations which he hoped sincerely would weigh with the Government. Certainly this was an opportunity for them to prove that they were not disposed to be swayed in all directions by the various sections of their supporters. He knew there was an opinion in the House in favour of these reductions. One opinion came from hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway who looked forward to a time when nations would settle their differences by means of international arbitration. He knew that they looked to this country to set an example in that direction by maintaining no Army and no Navy whatsoever. While agreeing that such a state of things would be of inestimable benefit, the world had not yet arrived at that state of education at which it would be possible to carry out such an arrangement. Those hon. Members, he felt sure—and he said it with regret—would look upon these reductions with satisfaction, and he had no doubt that they would express the opinion that they were only the forerunners of further reductions—a risk which no Government was justified in running. There was another section of the House equally in favour of the reductions, and who in their clamour for a wholesale reduction of our forces suggested no alternate scheme, though he believed that section was as desirous as anyone in the House that we should maintain our position among the nations of the world. The attitude of those hon. Gentlemen was one he could not under any circumstances comprehend. An aspect of the question which could not be put in a strong enough light was the effect the reductions would have upon the officers and non-commissioned officers in the various battalions concerned. It must be borne in mind that it was the foremost ambition of every officer and non-commissioned officer to command the battery, regiment, or battalion in which he had given the best years of his life. What would be done with the majority of these officers who had risen from rank to rank to that of major? There was only one course to pursue with regard to them, and that was a polite War Office letter relegating them to half-pay, which meant that men in the prime of life who had served their country, perhaps, on active service, and—what was duller and more arduous—in the daily routine of soldiering at home, would have to give up all idea of attaining an object which to most of them had been a life-long ambition. If this scheme were in any way beneficial to the country he felt sure that no one, and least of all the men most deeply concerned, would venture to say a word against the reduction; but the scheme was simply held out with a view to appeasing the ultra-economical section of the Liberal Party. That economies could be made he admitted, but he was convinced that no large economy with regard to the Army could possibly be effected, and certainly not on the lines of the scheme suggested. If economies of this description were effected, it could only be at the risk of endangering the efficiency and the power of our military force.

*COLONEL HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.) said the noble Lord who had just sat down had ascribed to Ministerialists some dangerous notions with regard to the defences of the Empire, but he thought the noble Lord would be good enough to make exceptions in the case of some of them who, like himself, and a former comrade, the Member for Stockton, whom he saw in his place below the gangway, had served Her late Majesty and His present Majesty for a number of years. He had had the honour of rising, in the manner described by the noble Lord, from rank to rank for thirty years in a regiment of Guards, and the noble Lord would admit that under these circumstances he had the honour and dignity of the Army and the necessities of Imperial defence quite as much at heart as the noble Lord himself. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War on having performed the feat, unusual in recent years, of making a statement which did not involve increase of expenditure on military affairs. Even more than that, the right hon. Gentleman had indicated a very important and considerable reduction of that expenditure. He had no intention of crossing swords with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean and the hon. Baronet the Member for the Chippenham Division of Wiltshire on the vexed question which they inaccurately termed the linked battalion system. On that question he would congratulate the Secretary of State for War upon having decided to advance slowly. The right hon. Gentleman had not been led into a sudden and complete change of system from that which had existed with more or less success—he did not say with complete success—since the days of Mr. Cardwell. The present was no time for making those great experiments which would be involved by such a change as was contemplated by the right hon. Baronet for the creation of a territorial Army on a new system. He was glad that the Secretary of State for War had decided to adhere in general to the system which existed before he took office, and to advance slowly, at the same time applying to what had been described as the bloated condition of armaments that treatment by absorption which was calculated to reduce the figure of our military expenditure. In the interesting statement which the right hon. Gentleman made two months ago, he said the first thing we wanted was absolutely clear thinking about the purposes for which the Army existed, and the principles upon which it was to be organised. No one who listened to the right hon. Gentleman to-day could fail to have been struck by the fact that he must have been doing a good deal of thinking, but there were one or two points on which he would have been glad to have had a little clearer expression. One of those points in particular was with regard to the liabilities to which all military preparation must be directed and the calculation of assets for the meeting of those liabilities. The right hon. Gentleman had given in round numbers what were considered to be the requirements for India, and for a striking force organised in this country, but he had not touched upon the real key to the question of the numbers of our military force at the present day, the number of troops which it was necessary for us to maintain in the Colonies. They had been told on a former occasion how largely those troops had been increased. They had been given to-day no clear indication as to what was the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the probabilities of largely reducing that part of the Army. The right hon. Gentleman had told them it was true that there were certain battalions in South Africa which would come under the operation of the reduction, but he had not given any sort of idea as to what were the views held by the War Office as to the probability of our continuing to maintain so large a force as there was at present in those Colonies. The three parts of our Imperial force, namely, that employed in India, that employed in the Colonies, and the force at home, might be divided roughly into troops of the first line and those of the second line. The troops in India must belong to the first line, and they had to be supported by a certain number of troops of the same class at home to furnish the drafts. The new Colonies they hoped in the future might pass into that happier condition which was shown now in Canada and Australia, where troops of the second line could be employed. Here at home he imagined that the right hon. Gentleman's general idea was to place the defence more in the hands of the second line of troops. However good that class might be there must be something to constitute a stiffening, and in that respect he thought the Brigade of Guards was an important factor. He should have been glad to have heard from the right hon. Gentleman that if it were necessary to reduce the strength of those battalions he would reduce the numerical force and not the units. He hoped that before the debate was brought to an end they would have some clear statement from the right hon. Gentleman with regard to his intentions on this subject. He could not, for the life of him, understand why it should be better to perform the operation of amputation on two of the regiments rather than to apply the system of absorption to all the regiments, which the right hon. Gentleman himself had described as the proper treatment in the case of bloated armaments. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the question of justice as though it were a question of justice between Guards' battalions and Line battalions. He ventured to say that no such feeling entered into the mind of any soldier, whether he belonged to the Guards or to the Line. The functions of these two branches of the Army were entirely different, and he would express the hope that before this dislocation of two distinguished regiments was finally decided upon, earnest thought might be given to it, and that the House might be furnished with the fullest statement of the conclusions upon which the present proposal had been based. It could not be merely a question of economy, for surely it was not more economical to destroy two battalions in the older regiments than to disband a large battalion of a new regiment with its expensive regimental establishment. He did not wish to say anything which might be interpreted as a want of sympathy with the junior regiment of Irish Guards, but obviously it was better to have three regiments of three battalions each than to have four regiments each with a different system of organisation. He could not help feeling a sense of regret that the very important statement of the right hon. Gentleman should have been made on the occasion of the War Office Vote. It was unfortunate that the Committee should have been drawn away from the consideration of one of the most important parts of our military system, and from discussing the efficiency of what had been described as the instrument for carrying out the policy of the Government and the brain of the Army. If the War Office was not efficient, then we were paying £500,000 too much for it. It was not possible to consider the effect of the large changes which had been made at the War Office when all minds were occupied with a fresh statement of policy. As a soldier, he associated himself fully with the congratulations which had been expressed that the Secretary of State for War had entered upon a period of economy in the military service. He knew how little the country got for its large expenditure upon the Army, and they were all anxious to receive better value for their money. He thought by approaching these difficult problems in the way he had done the right hon. Gentleman was taking the surest way for eventually arriving at that consummation which all so much desired—a cheap and efficient Army. He should like to be quite sure that in all the proposals made for reduction the fullest consideration had been paid to their effect upon the whole system. He hoped the spirit of the old regiments would be cherished and preserved, and if that were done he felt sure that officers and men of all ranks would give the best service they could to the State.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said the time at the disposal of the Committee had been very much curtailed by several extremely long speeches, and the reply of the Secretary of State for War and the speech of the Leader of the Opposition would necessarily cut down the time to an almost unfair limit. With regard to what had been said about the reduction of the Brigade of Guards, he would narrow down his remarks to the regiment in which he had had the honour of serving, namely, the Coldstreams. He thought the battalion of Coldstream Guards should be the very last to be reduced, because it was founded in 1897, whilst the Irish regiment, which was founded in 1900, and formed part of a scheme by which it was intended to raise the battalions of Guards to twelve. There was no demand from Ireland that there should be an Irish regiment of Guards, and he could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman should have departed from the usual precedent when reducing battalions of applying his reduction to the last formed regiments. In the case of non-commissioned officers and men the difficulty was accentuated because the Irish Guards were a younger regiment, and they might be absorbed into the various regiments from which they had been transferred with greater ease than would be the case with the older established regiments. At the present time the Coldstream Guards were thirty-six above their establishment and the battalion could be well maintained. There was no lack of officers and only four probationers, whilst the Grenadiers had sixteen probationers, the Scots Guards fourteen, and the Irish Guards three. He thought it was only right that these facts should be emphasised. He was not now pleading that the right hon. Gentleman should reconsider his decision to reduce the Brigade of Guards, although he believed he was wrong in taking that step. The Secretary of State for War said he was absolutely determined upon that point, and no doubt he had consulted his military advisers. When the representatives of the late Government stated that they had consulted Lord Roberts, they were frequently accused of sheltering themselves behind that great man. Now the right hon. Gentleman told them that he had not taken a single step without consulting the military experts, who believed that the course he was taking was right. In not disestablishing a younger Guards battalion, he thought it was unfair to the older regiments, and if a battalion of Guards must be reduced, it should not have been the Coldstreams. He would not now enter into the question of the hardship that might be done to both officers and men, but would content himself for the present with the promise that there should be no hardship. He would like to know how the Government were going to insure to the officers of these battalions which were about to be disbanded their chance of promotion. The Secretary of State for War had produced a very remarkable scheme, but he had seen produced three remarkable schemes, which had not all been received with enthusiasm, and which did not remain as a proof of the ability of any single man to reconstruct the British Army on a principle satisfactory either for peace or war.

*MR. A. L. LEVER (Essex, Harwich) said he felt he would have accorded to him that courtesy which was always extended to new Members addressing the House for the first time. He was one of those who deprecated long speeches, and he believed in the advisability of not speaking at all unless driven to it by some special circumstances. He felt bound to intervene in this debate because he had advocated a reduction of the expenditure upon the Army. He did so more especially during the last election in view of the enormous increase in the cost of the Army under the late Administration. He thought a satisfactory reduction could be made in the expenditure without seriously reducing the numbers of the Army, and without in any way diminishing its efficiency as an instrument of war. This could be done by pruning and lopping off all superfluities and doing away with the wanton waste that so frequently took place at the War Office. We might economise by ceasing to send Militia battalions from Scotland to the other end of England to be trained, and by discontinuing the sending of officers to India and paying their expenses, when it was known perfectly well that they were only going to remain six, eight, or ten weeks longer. Lord Roberts had stated that the lessons of the late war appeared to have been completely forgotten. The early disasters in that campaign were not due to any paucity in numbers, but to the military authorities having forgotten the lessons of previous campaigns and repeating the self-same blunders committed in earlier campaigns, and to our general unpreparedness for war. Had they taken the advice of Lord Wolseley and mobilised an Army Corps and Cavalry Division on Salisbury Plain in the June of the year when the war broke out they would have been in a better position and would have been able to take the offensive instead of acting on the defensive for so long a period. He wished to say a few words about the Volunteer force. The military system of this country was so interwoven with the Auxiliary Forces and was so dependent upon the numbers and strength and the part they were destined to play in the defence of the Empire in the future that it was a subject which he might very well mention. The question was how the forces of the Crown were to be expanded. Lord Roberts had stated that—

> "No military system can be considered satisfactory which does not contain powers of

expansion outside the Regular forces of the Crown."

The Secretary of State for War had declared that we must depend largely on the Auxiliary and Volunteer Forces. Having served himself sixteen or seventeen years as a Volunteer officer, he recognised all the difficulties, and he also recognised that if the Volunteers ceased to exist—as they would have done had they continued to have Ministers for War like Mr. Brodrick—we should be driven to that hated system of conscription which would sap and undermine and demoralise the youth of the nation. Mr. Brodrick gave the Volunteers to understand that they were not wanted and that he considered they were a useless and inefficient force. The result was that both Volunteer officers and men were disheartened, and they left the force in all directions. But bad as the conditions for the Volunteers were under Mr. Brodrick, they became worse under his successor, and the varying terms of service caused many of the men to leave. All this time no adequate provision was made for the training of the men in shooting and no attempt made to provide the necessary rifle ranges. Surely it could not be expected that any commanding officer would produce first class shots if rifle ranges were not provided. If the finances were in that parlous condition it would be better to give up and abandon the week's training in camp, and allocate the money to the provision of rifle ranges. Lord Roberts had stated that the Volunteers were inefficiently trained and officered, and he quite agreed with that statement. Surely the whole responsibility for that rested with the War Office. If they wished to secure efficiency they must take into consideration the avocations of the men in the various districts where the Volunteer battalions existed. It was perfectly certain that men engaged in agricultural districts, and others employed in manufacturing centres, could not go into camp at the same time. There must be greater elasticity and less adhesion to red-tapeism if they were to improve the condition of the Volunteer force. Then, again, he thought greater care should be exercised in the selection of adjutants. Many of these men were totally unsuited for the position they occupied. They might be admirable soldiers and the best leaders of men, but they might not be able to act as instructors, just as in civil life one found the most scholarly men, men of high degrees, who were absolutely unsuited for the posts of teachers. We wanted specially trained men who could impart knowledge to others. He would add that he personally had always served under the best of adjutants, but others had not been so fortunate. He thought everybody would agree with Lord Roberts that the Volunteers were inefficiently officered. But was that to be wondered at when they considered that the Volunteer officer was not regarded with the honour and respect due to any one holding His Majesty's commission? The officers were very often not very capable, and they did not seem to have any great desire to become so or as efficient as they ought to be. That was simply because there was no incentive. The question arose, "How is all this to be remedied?" There was great difficulty in the matter, he knew, but he would like to see Volunteer officers placed upon an equality with the officers of the Yeomanry and Militia. He might be told that the Volunteers were not under the Army Act. He suggested that the same rules and regulations should be applied to them as to the Militia and the Yeomanry. If the reins of discipline were tightened, and the *status* improved, he was sure that the Volunteers would respond cordially and willingly. While he recognised the advantages of the territorial arrangement described by the Secretary of State for War, he thought it was an absolute necessity that there should be a General officer in supreme command of the Volunteers, who should be responsible to the Council of War for the training, organisation, and equipment of the force. He would of necessity be an officer of distinction who was sympathetically inclined towards the Volunteers, such an officer, for instance, as General Turner. There would then be a chance of the force being materially improved for the benefit of the country. He appealed to the Secretary of State for War to take these small matters into consideration.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) congratulated the Secretary of State for War on the extremely able speech which he had made. He had heard a good many speeches by Secretaries of State for War. Some of them went up like a rocket and a good many of them came down like a stick. He did not think that would the case with the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. He could not help thinking that the Government had not chosen the psychological moment to reduce the Army 10 per cent. in view of the recent speech of the Foreign Secretary in reference to Egypt, and looking at the state of unrest which existed in all Mahommedan countries under the British sceptre. If reduction must take place, then he thought there was much less harm in reducing *personnel* than in reducing cadres. It made no difference whatever if there were cadres behind them, but, as had been said, by reducing the cadres they got rid of the skeleton on which they might put the Reservists when they were brought up. He sympathised with those who had pleaded the cause of the Guards. The Guards were practically the only battalions that could be sent on service at a moment's notice, and the system of enlistment secured for them a big Reserve. The facts stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon in regard to this matter were indisputable. The Foot Guards were 7,000 strong, and the Reserves consisted of 7,000 men. He did not think the Secretary of State for War could as cheaply find 14,000 men, and yet of all the battalions these were the ones which the right hon. Gentleman had taken out for reduction. One word about the gunners. The right hon. Gentleman must know very well that while the infantry soldier could be improvised in a month it took a couple of years to get a good gunner. He did not see how capable artillerymen were to be got from the Militia in time of emergency under the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman. It was through want of trained gunners that the army raised by Gambetta during the Franco-German war did not make a better appearance in the field. He was sorry to hear the right hon. Gentleman say that it was possible in future that we might go further in pruning the Navy and in cutting down other battalions. Of course the resources of civilisation were not exhausted. The right hon. Gentleman might scrap the Navy and disband the Army, get the country placed under the protection of Spain or Holland, and hand over the money saved to the Battersea Dogs' Home or the Poplar Guardians, but his new heaven and earth would not last very long.

MR. BRACE (Glamorganshire, S.) said that while he listened with admiration to the speech of the Secretary of State for War he felt considerable disappointment. He had expected a much more substantial reduction in the cost of the Army than had been announced. He had listened with great attention to the special pleading on behalf of certain regiments; he pleaded on behalf of the ratepayers of the country, who really were much over-burdened with taxation. As a representative of Labour he could have no hope to see effected those social reforms of which the country was in need unless a substantial reduction was made in the cost of the Army and Navy. Whatever might be the outcome of the scheme laid before the Committee to-day, the right hon. Gentleman might be sure that nothing could happen which would be worse than had happened under the schemes of his predecessors. The primary function of a standing Army was to sustain a satisfactory peace, and if they could get a fighting machine at a small cost it would be better for the country and the Army itself. He was glad to hear the Government were taking a general survey of the whole question of Army and Naval expenditure. Since 1897 the cost of the Army had been increased by over £10,000,000, and he did not believe that the political situation at all warranted that enormous expenditure. In the same period the expenditure on the Navy had been increased by £11,000,000. He thought the time had come when a progressive Administration should take this question in hand, and with the pressure of popular opinion behind them reduce the cost of the Army at any rate to something like what it was in 1897. The noble Lord had said that the Labour

Members wanted to abolish both the Army and Navy. Nothing of the sort. The Labour Members believed that as long as other nations maintained large Naval and Military forces we must have both an efficient Army and an efficient Navy. But he believed that there was no nation in the world more capable than the United Kingdom to take the lead in bringing about a better understanding between nation and nation so as to secure a reduction of armaments.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): It is evidently impossible that in a single night's debate we can do more than make a commencement of this discussion, and I am confident that His Majesty's Government will see that this can only be the preliminary to many nights that must be given to this important theme. The present Secretary for War will not desire, and can scarcely hope, to avoid the fate of his predecessors, who had their schemes discussed at great, though not undue length, before any action was taken by the responsible Government. I need only remind the right hon. Gentleman of what was done in 1901, when after many days spent in Supply the scheme of my right hon. friend was embodied in various propositions. I do not know if that precedent is to be followed, but this I say, that we should not allow the right hon. Gentleman to embody his proposals in actual policy until we have had a far more extended discussion than the present opportunity can afford. In making this appeal for further time, I may be allowed to say a few words on the statement we have heard to-night. Of the ability of that statement there can be no question. We are all agreed that the right hon. Gentleman has added to his Parliamentary reputation by the long and interesting statement he has given of his policy. If he will allow me to offer one modest criticism upon the form of that statement, it would be that I think to a certain extent he ignored the work which his predecessors in office had done, and spoke in terms unduly disparaging of the efforts, the successful efforts, they made to increase the efficiency of the Army. I do not imagine that the right hon. Gentleman requires any warning from me on the subject, but if he does, I would remind him that nobody has held the office he holds without having to undergo very unpleasant criticism, without meeting with extraordinary difficulties in this House and in the country, without being made the object of hostile commentary from all the numerous classes of Army reformers, each having his peculiar expedient, and all prepared to unite in opposition to the War Secretary for the time being. That has been the fate of every Secretary for War since I have had the opportunity of observing Parliamentary procedure, and I do not think he can avoid a fate that has overtaken his most distinguished predecessors in office. He made use of a somewhat rash phrase when he said he was going to recast the whole system and make the Army for use and not for show. Was it not so under his predecessors? He may differ in policy, he may be opposed to them in details, but it is not wise for any Secretary of State to say of himself that he means to make the Army an instrument for use and not an instrument for show, implying by that that those who before him carried an enormous burden of responsibility on their shoulders had a different object in view or had showed less capacity or industry in carrying out the object they had at heart. I ought to say of the right hon. Gentleman that, if he was not wholly charitable to his immediate predecessors, he did me individually full justice, perhaps even more than justice, in his reference to the Committee of Defence. In that reference he gave full recognition to what I was able to do as Chairman of that Committee, with generous meed of approbation. I thank him for it, and only wish he had treated his predecessor in office with the same kindness and generosity.

The right hon. Gentleman is, of course, like every Secretary for War, in a very difficult, embarrassing position. No industry or genius will make the task of the reorganisation of our great voluntary Army other than the most difficult task that can fall to any Minister of any country. No foreign Minister for War has a burden comparable to that of the Minister for War in this country, no foreign Minister has the problem he has to solve, no foreign Government has to depend absolutely on a volunteer Army of which the terms cannot be varied from day to day. An employer can raise or lower the number of his *employes* as circumstances require, but that is not the position of the Secretary for War. He is the biggest employer in the country, but he cannot change his terms, or if he does he incurs an enormous responsibility. He has difficulties incomparably more complex than the Minister for War in France, Germany, Italy, or Russia, and I have every sympathy for that Minister. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman is capable of doing great service in the difficult office which he now fills. I am not sure that he will perform it better by ignoring what has been done before, or by suggesting that the changes he is prepared to make are fundamental and are going to open a new era of military history. I gathered that these were the hopes of the right hon. Gentleman, but I did not gather from his speech that these hopes were likely to be accomplished. He told us he has gone round the whole military system, asking each man in turn the purpose he was going to serve when war breaks out. He has criticised every branch of the Department with a view of eliminating all useless elements. But I did not gather from his statement that there is much that he is going to eliminate, or that he is going to make any very important changes.

I particularly wanted to hear what he was going to say with regard to the Volunteers in this connection. There are 250,000 Volunteers enrolled. A large portion of these have their duties allocated to them. They have to garrison our great seaports and they have to provide force enough to repel any raid the possibility of which we can contemplate. But the total number required for these services is 170,000 men. That leaves at least 70,000 to whom the right hon. Gentleman has put the question as to their value, and I did not gather that he has got as yet any answer. I await that answer with great curiosity. His predecessors were vehemently attacked for saying the number of Volunteers was in excess of the requirements of the country. On that point I do not pronounce any opinion. But the right hon. Gentleman told us the only Volunteers to whom the Army Council can allocate duties are 170,000. I should like to know what military purpose is to be served by the remaining 70,000, and how they got through that critical examination to which the right hon. Gentleman has subjected every branch of the military forces of this country.

I do not propose to discuss any further the territorial army. I do not wish to add anything to what was said by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. He made some very pertinent criticisms, but he felt, as I feel, that until the right hon. Gentleman is in a position to tell us with more clearness and precision what it is that he desires to do, we should perhaps be wasting our time if we were to attempt any detailed comment on the schemes which have been adumbrated but may never come into practical operation. Therefore I will confine myself entirely to his statement in regard to the Regular Army.

The first point on which I would ask the attention of the Committee relates to the artillery. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman to the ears of any casual listener would appear to indicate that he has made the artillery a far more efficient arm than it was left by his predecessors, and has greatly improved the system under which the artillery are to be organised. I do not at all criticise many parts of that speech. I think he was well advised in using the garrison artillery as he suggests. I think that is a most public, wise, and economical scheme. But when he told us that he was going to improve the artillery, he forgot to mention that the difficulty of mobilising the artillery at the present time to the full extent of the balance we possess is largely due to the fact that the number of artillerymen has not yet produced the necessary reserves. Everybody admits that artillerymen must be experts. Does the right hon. Gentleman's plan increase the number of trained experts we shall in the future have at our command? Surely not. He is going to get rid of 3,800 Regular artillery. But that is not all. At present the artillerymen are engaged on the three and nine years' system, under which you rapidly accumulate a reserve. The right hon. Gentleman is going to alter that and substitute six years. If you take the two things together—the dismissal of men and the alteration in the terms of service—it is manifest that in a few years we shall have a very much smaller number of Regular artillerymen than we have at present, and than we should have if the right hon. Gentleman had left the present system untouched. I do not think that is a change to which the House ought readily to assent. I should like to have an opportunity of thinking more over it than I have been able to do at present, and I should like to see the right hon. Gentleman's whole scheme before pronouncing a judgment. It is impossible, I think, to suggest that a scheme which by this double process diminishes the Regular artillerymen is one which in the long run is likely to add greatly to the strength of that particular branch of the Service. As everybody admits that the importance of artillery in modern armies is great and growing, I have some misgivings as to the result of the right hon. Gentleman's proposals.

I have a more important criticism to make upon the whole theory that appears to underlie the right hon. Gentleman's reduction of Regular units. I lay down no hard and fast rule with regard to the number of Regular units we ought to keep. I am prepared to consider a scheme which would involve a diminution—not a very large one, but still a diminution—in our Regular units provided we see before us a plan by which the Regular Army is to be expanded in times of stress and difficulty by a cheaper and, no doubt, a less efficient force, but a force which in the course of the war might become thoroughly efficient. The right hon. Gentleman has based his whole scheme upon his power of immediately mobilising 154,000 men. All his criticisms of the previous Government were in the direction of saying, "You cannot mobilise 154,000 men. I can. Therefore, my plan is better than yours." I think that erroneous. I am quite unable to imagine any situation which would require the instantaneous mobilisation of 154,000 men. The right hon. Gentleman talked as if there was to be an expedition beyond the seas in which 154,000 men were to be straightway embarked and transported off to some distant theatre of operations. The contingency requiring such an expedition might occur, but it is not very easy to imagine that it would. We might be asked to land 150,000 men on the coast of Europe, but I do not know that I should sacrifice much money or take enormous pains so to organise my force that that could be done straight away and immediately. What is required, so far as I am able to see, is the power of sending continuous reinforcements to India in a great emergency. That does not mean sending 150,000 men straight off in a few weeks to Bombay. You must be able to reinforce your Indian Army, to make up the wastage of war, to add to the strength of that Army, and make it competent to deal with European troops upon the North-west frontier. That does not require the sort of expedition the right hon. Gentleman appeared to contemplate. What does it require? It requires an army of more than 150,000 men—I do not say 500,000, which I should think an extravagant estimate for any war we are ever likely to be engaged in; but what we do require in case of trouble on the North-west frontier of India is not 150,000 men ready at a moment's notice, but a force of more than that, which as the war proceeds—and such a war would be long—we should be able to put forward in the fighting line in India itself and on the lines of communication. How does the right hon. Gentleman's plan help us to that result? In my opinion it is a retrograde step, and not merely and chiefly because it destroys a certain number of infantry, but because it destroys units, and officers and non-commissioned officers. I understand that the destruction of these ten battalions means that we lose 300 officers, 800 non-commissioned officers, 4,800 men of the Line with the colours, 1,400 Guards with the colours, 3,200 Line Reserve, and 1,400 Guards Reserve, in all 10,800, men besides the officers.

SIR CHARLES DILKE was understood to say that some of these did not exist at present.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In some of the regiments the right hon. Gentleman may be right. But in the officers you have really what we most require for carrying on such prolonged operations, the only operations I can contemplate for which this force of 150,000 men would be required at all. Is that a wise or economic proceeding? You will require what is called a striking force to deal with some Continental situation, the defence of Belgium, for instance, or some country which our strategy in the world obliges us to defend, and that you require to be ready at a moment's notice. You require it to be perfectly efficient, fully equipped, and prepared for instantaneous action. But for the prolonged operations that I can alone contemplate in connection with a force like 150,000 men, it seems to me you cannot do a worse service to the country than by depriving yourself of the capability of expansion in time of war and of the officers and non-commissioned officers in which we are notoriously and avowedly weak.

But I would consent, and gladly consent even to that reduction if the right hon. Gentleman had given us a scheme by which he was going to expand the Army in case of national emergency. He has no scheme at all. He has talked about a territorial Army, and talked, with truth, of the difficulties under which the Militia labour. Have we got a Militia now which is capable of supplying that expansion which we desire? Has he been able so to organise a territorial Army that we can count upon it to fill up the gaps caused by the wastage of war, by death and disease, and all the elements which make the power of reinforcement absolutely necessary? He has got no scheme at all. He has hopes, expectations, in some respects I would almost say he has dreams, but as to a scheme which has been tried, which has been shown to be efficient, that he neither has nor pretends to have. The question I ask the Committee is, is not the right hon. Gentleman beginning at the wrong end? Is he not attempting to reduce the Regular units before he has made up the machinery for expanding his Army, instead of devising the machinery for expanding his Army and then reducing his Regular units? Can there be a reply to it? I do not know what it is, unless it be that the right hon. Gentleman feels under some political necessity for the immediate reduction of the Army and that for that political necessity he is prepared, temporarily at all events, to sacrifice the efficiency of the Army in the hope that he may be able to devise a scheme which will make up for any destruction of units to which he is forced by the pressure of his friends. It is just like the dishonest—not dishonest, I do not wish to use that word in connection with the right hon. Gentleman—but like the trustee who gambles with trust funds and who then too often finds that, although he had every intention of paying back the funds, he unfortunately is not in a position to do so. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman is perfectly honest in his expectations and confident in his hopes, but he and all of us know the extraordinary difficulty of this problem, the immense risks which attach to any attempt to make the Militia what we wish them to be, or the Volunteers what we hope they may be. All I ask is that this House shall have the common prudence and common self-control to refuse to assent to reductions in Regular units until they have before them in the clearest specific, practical shape some plan which will give us that expansible power which all who have ever studied the military problem at all deem is the real necessity of this country. When the right hon. Gentleman brings forward that plan in a practical shape, he will not find in me an opponent of the reduction of some of our units. All I would ask him—all I would ask the Committee—to do is to remember that although it is not easy to reduce units, it is easier to reduce units than to find their substitutes, and that the problem before us will not be solved until a scheme is really produced which would satisfy us, not that we have 150,000 men ready to start to-morrow, which would be too much, but that we have an Army, partly Regular, partly on a Militia basis, which is capable of sending more than 100,000 men and would be capable of dealing with any of these difficulties which, however remote, are of a character which we cannot exclude from our view if we are really to be prudent trustees of the fate of the Empire.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercrombie) said he did not propose to detain the Committee, but perhaps as a member of the Committee to which reference had been made, he might be permitted to join with the others who had spoken in expressing the belief that much good might result by the complete territorialisation of the Yeomanry and the

Volunteers, and such other forces as were not included in the Regular Army. Such differences as might exist in the minds of hon. Members on both sides of the House as to how they could best territorialise the whole Army would depend upon how far they ought to go in the devolution of powers. While sympathising with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean as to the danger of devolution of powers of control by the House and the Treasury, he was convinced of the general desirability of the devolution of many local matters which the War Office had hitherto dealt with. He congratulated the Secretary for War on his courage in reducing not only by numbers but by cadres. It was a mistake, however, for him to suppose that in reducing the Regular Army he would be adding to the number of the unemployed. It was enlistment in the Army that added to the number of unemployed, for the numbers by which the Army was reduced would now learn a useful trade, instead of joining the Army and being thrown back afterwards on the labour market. They had seen to-night a welcome thing—the Army treated apart from Party politics. It would be well if they could for ever take the Army out of the realm of Party politics. He had a scheme for doing that which he would indicate on a more appropriate occasion. It would involve placing the Leader of the Opposition permanently on the Committee of Defence. He gathered from his gesture that he did not relish that proposition. But it was only by making the Committee of Defence a body representing no particular Party that they would ever reduce the Regular Army without Party recriminations.

*MR. HALDANE: My hon. and gallant friend has put his finger upon what is essential if the Auxiliary Forces are effectively to be reorganised. So complicated are the details that it is impossible to settle on any centralised system; and I am certain that a necessary link in any general scheme of Army reform is the management of local military affairs in the counties, so far as they are administrative, through some kind of local control. Command, of course. must remain in the hands of Regular officers. But administration is a different thing. The whole spirit of our scheme of Army organisation is devolution of administration. It is true, as the Leader of the Opposition said, that I have not dwelt upon that aspect of things. But I did say that these matters are essentially matters for legislation. It is necessary that a Bill should be introduced; and the proper time to discuss the subject is when we propose to deal with it next session. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of expansion. It is in this connection that it seems to me the one chance of expansion comes. Assuming that you put conscription out of account—and I think there has been to-night a consensus of opinion that it should be put out of account — what remains? It is that the people should organise themselves in accordance with guidance which is to be given to them on the spot. It is true that mobilisation under the General Staff provides for 140,000 infantry for repelling raids and looking after garrison duties. There is a surplus; and that surplus, to my mind, is to be the nucleus of a much larger body which I hope to see grow up, a body in which men will take their part and bear their share of the burden, not because they are dragooned into it, but because it is a duty cast upon them to prepare, in the last emergency, to defend their hearths and their homes; and it comes to this, that if you make the training of the Volunteer Forces more elastic than it is at present, if you try in its arrangement to suit the convenience of people, you have a chance of making good material of that expansion of which the right hon. Gentleman spoke, and which I am sure you will not get in any other form. It is to quantity and not to quality in time of peace you must look for that expansion. In time of war, recognising that all probability points to having considerable time to work up that raw material, you have the chance, which no other nation would have under similar conditions, of providing such machinery as will give you a stream of men, if there be sufficient spirit in the people, that will make a substantial addition to your Regular Forces. If such an elastic organisation were obtained at home, what with the self-governing parts of the King's dominions beyond the seas, where the interests of the Empire are held as dearly at heart as they are here, I say that the Empire has within its borders, on a voluntary basis and without the slightest shadow of compulsion, such potentialities of the expansion of its yet has this merit, that it puts before it a simple object, and, making for that object, it looks neither to the right nor to the left.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said that everything came to those who waited. He had received a message that day from his constituents asking him to support any proposal to increase the comfort of the soldiers, but that it was most important that the Army should not be reduced. He insisted, therefore, that the reduction in the Army, proposed by the right hon. Gentleman, had not been called for by the country. ["Oh oh."] He would call to the recollection of hon. Members opposite, who were always talking about mandates, that there was no mandate for the reduction of the Army. ["Oh, oh."] It was perfectly outrageous that such a proposal should be settled in a seven hours debate, of which the right hon. Gentleman himself had occupied upwards of three hours, and only four or five Members had had the opportunity of placing their views before their constituencies and the country. Therefore, he begged to move that progress be reported and that the Chairman ask leave to sit again.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again"—(*Sir Howard Vincent*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

MOTOR-OMNIBUS ACCIDENT.

On the Motion for the adjournment of the House.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford) asked the President of the Local Government Board whether he had any information as to the accident to a Vanguard motor-omnibus near Crawley, whether an official inquiry would be held, and whether the Department would be represented at the inquest.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) said he had seen with great regret an account in the evening papers of this calamity. The House, he was sure, would be profoundly sorry to know that ten people had been killed and twenty-four injured by this regrettable accident. The Local Government Board were only concerned with the making of regulations as to the use and construction of motor-cars, and one of these regulations required that a motor-car should have two independent brakes in good working order and of such efficiency that the application of either would cause two of the wheels to be so held that they were effectually prevented from revolving. He would keep himself informed of the evidence at the inquest and see that the departments concerned were represented thereat. On behalf of the House he offered his condolences with the relatives of the victims.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University) asked whether the Local Government Board had power to inspect these omnibuses.

MR. JOHN BURNS said that the duty of inspection devolved on two or three different authorities.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would be prepared to introduce legislation for the better control of these vehicles.

MR. JOHN BURNS said that the Report of the Motor Cars Commission would be in the hands of Members very soon; and if it were possible by administrative or legislative action to take precautions against the recurrence of such accidents, he hoped the House would give such action its support.

Adjourned at eight minutes after
Eleven o'Clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, 13*th July*, 1906.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught and Strathearn singly took the Oath.

The Earl of Lonsdale took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7).

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill. The Lord Chancellor informed the House that the Promotors do not intend to proceed further with the Bill: Ordered that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

St. John's (Westminster) Improvement Bill. The Lord Chancellor informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn: The orders made on the 3rd instant and yesterday discharged, and Bill committed for Tuesday next.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 9) Bill. A witness ordered to attend the Select Committee.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Baeup Corporation Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Edinburgh Corporation Bill. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill, Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill. Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Municipal Corporations Bill, Wireless Telegraphy Bill. Returned from the Commons, with the Amendment to each Bill agreed to.

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT, No. 2 (1906).

Correspondence respecting the Turco-Egyptian Frontier in the Sinai Peninsula (with a map).

ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE.

Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. Vols. I., II., III., Minutes of Evidence. Vol. IV., Index and Appendices.

Presented (by Command) and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEWS IN WAR TIME.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I rise to call attention to recent conferences of the Committee of Imperial Defence with a sub-committee of the Newspaper Society on the question of dissemination of news in time of war or emergency, and to the proceedings of a meeting of that society, presided over by Mr. Walter, which took place on June 21st, at which there was a unanimous approval of the principle that some legislation was necessary; and to ask His Majesty's Government whether they have fully considered the responsibility that they will incur if they prolong the period during which this country must run unnecessary risks, and whether they will endeavour to lessen those risks by at once introducing a Bill dealing with the question.

The patriotic endeavours of Mr. Walter and other prominent members of the Newspaper Society in trying to get the whole of the journalism of this country into line on the question of the dissemination of news in time of war or emergency deserve the gratitude of the community

On June 21st, at the Royal United Service Institution, the Newspaper Society authorised their sub-committee to consider any Bill that might be drafted on the subject, as they naturally wished to see it, before pledging themselves to support it. I am desirous of knowing if the Government will meet their views by producing such a Bill. Since I first raised the question in this House and lectured on it at the Royal United Service Institution they have had ample time to prepare one. I should not have called your attention to this subject last year if I had not believed that I was expressing the views of the whole of the British Navy and also the opinions of the more thoughtful portion of our Army. Nor should I have persevered had it not been for the encouragement I have received from my brother officers.

The necessity of secrecy of movement in time of war has been frequently referred to in the Press since March, 1905, and not one single man, whether soldier, sailor or civilian, has come forward with his voice or with his pen to defend our present position. The Government have an immense majority in another place. I, for one, should be sorry to see that majority dispersed before it had passed an important Act of Parliament which could be approved of by all parties in the State, one which would benefit the whole country. I say that such an Act would benefit the whole country because, although during the first fortnight of a war newspaper profits might perhaps be somewhat greater than if such laws did not exist, the increased security that such a measure would give to all the invested capital in the United Kingdom would be shared by the capital invested in newspapers. I say that there would only be about a fortnight of such increased profits, because the moment fighting with a first-class Power began there would be a cry for a most stringent Bill of this description from Land's End to John O'Groat's. Such a Bill, however, might then be too late. A hideous disaster might already have occurred. Russia was never on even terms with Japan after the attack on Port Arthur, nor France with Germany after the battle of Worth.

The greater portion of the population of this country have no conception of the strain which even a slight interruption of their commerce would bring upon them. Yet every child who has enjoyed a game of hide-and-seek has grasped the principle of the necessity of secrecy in time of war. Whether its little playfellow is behind the rhododendrons, or whether it is creeping through the laurel bushes, are at the time matters of as great importance to the child as the question of the whereabouts of an enemy is to an admiral or general in later life. Therefore, I do not despair of getting the people of this country to understand that legislation is necessary if we would avoid defeat and disaster. The question may be put concisely as follows. Do you prefer always to have the latest news and to hear of defeat, or to wait for forty-eight hours with a greater chance of hearing of victory?

If the Government does not think that it can pass a Bill this year, why not publish the draft of a Bill now, so that it can be discussed on the platform and in the Press during the autumn and winter months? That would clear the way for it next year. If the Government has the courage to grasp the nettle and bring in a Bill approved of by the Committee of Imperial Defence, I think it will find that the Bill will not in either House meet with any opposition worthy of the name except on questions of detail—questions for Committee of the Whole House, not for Second Reading. The Press as a whole would, I believe, support such a Bill. Of course, there would be a small minority against it, but there always is a minority against every Bill. The Bill should only deal with news that might be of use to an enemy and should not interfere with criticism. With freedom of criticism the Press remains free. The liberties of this country are safe from all internal dangers, but they may have to be defended from external attacks. The Japanese newspapers never divulged news, but their criticisms of unsuccessful officers were far more severe than any of those that I read in our own Press during the South African War.

The judgments of our Press may sometimes be hard on individuals. But as a whole their comments have had the effect of increasing the efficiency of the Army and Navy, and both services are indebted to the newspapers for many useful reforms. Many of the articles that appear in our daily and weekly journals are written by men who thoroughly understand what they are writing about, and their productions have in consequence an educational value both to the Services and the public. A regular censorship on the South African pattern would be impossible. There are 2,461 newspapers in the United Kingdom. I doubt if we have 2,000 men competent to act as censors. If we were at war with a first-class Power, all those who were fit to undertake such duties would be far better employed in the field or at sea, unless they had lost either their arms or their legs. None but cripples could be spared, and there would be enough for duty in London only. Each newspaper should be its own censor and should publish nothing in contravention of the law under pain of prosecution. I do not think that courts-martial or special courts would be necessary. In England and Scotland, at least, such cases could safely be left to juries. In drawing up a Bill the question of carrier pigeons and other methods of transmitting news should be considered.

In dealing with an internal question such as education, if the House of Commons thinks that its predecessor has made a mistake, it can repeal an Act of Parliament, and shape further legislation as it may choose. But in an external matter Parliament is powerless. No Resolution of both Houses can repeal a naval or military disaster. You cannot repeal a Sedan or a Tsusima. With the law in its present state, if we find ourselves plunged into war we shall be courting defeat and shall most thoroughly deserve our punishment. The nation has no right to expose its soldiers and its sailors to the additional risks involved in having their movements and proceedings reported to an enemy for the benefit of the few newspapers that may oppose the measure.

In a recent leading article the *Globe* rightly said that—

> "In naval matters it may be of the last importance to keep the whereabouts of a naval base shrouded in the deepest and most profound mystery."

and that—

> "If the Bill is to be a reality the penalties for its infringement must be a reality also.

We constantly hear of combining efficiency and economy. A Bill dealing with this question would not only greatly increase our power of defence, but also our power of attack, and it would have the additional merit of not costing the country a single sixpence. It would, I think, do more to strengthen our position than an addition of £5,000,000 to the naval and military Estimates. Its passing would tend to preserve peace, for it would show other nations that we were more fully prepared for war. It would not annoy anyone in times of quiet, for it would lie dormant, until called into action by an Order in Council, and the inconvenience it would cause in time of war would be far more willingly submitted to than disaster. If such a disaster were serious —recollect that this country can be starved out in a month—there would be no question of a big loaf or a little loaf; there would be no loaf at all.

Last year we celebrated the centenary of Trafalgar. Let us remember that it was also the centenary of Ulm and Austerlitz. A few weeks before his death Nelson wrote to the Governor of Gibraltar, asking him not to allow the local gazette to publish news of the movements of his ships. At about the same time Napoleon wrote to Fouché that he was not to permit the papers to mention the existence of the French Army—

> "De faire défense de parler de l'armée française, pas plus que si elle n'existait pas."

The results were, the capitulation of Mack at Ulm, the capture of Vienna, and the victory of Austerlitz. The greatest compliment ever paid to the Duke of Wellington was when Marshal Ney said of him—

> "Il ne montre jamais ses troupes."

To return to more modern times, Togo and Oyama and the Japanese nation appear to have held very much the same views as the great warriors I have mentioned. If the Government were to bring forward a Bill now, there would be time to discuss it in another place during the autumn session while this House is dealing with the important Bills that will shortly be brought before it. This is not a Party question, and it ought never to be allowed to become one. If the Government introduce a measure of this description, I hope it will receive the support of those who sit on the Front Opposition Benches of both Houses.

The Government cannot guarantee peace, yet it leaves us partially disarmed for a twelve-month. Who can say that next year will be a more suitable time to introduce such a Bill? It may be blocked by a Home Rule Bill and massacred with other innocents at the end of July. Why put off till to-morrow what we ought to do to-day? The First Lord of the Admiralty and the Under-Secretary of State for War may say that they are quite ready to accept the responsibility of delay. Well, if they do so, I think it my duty to tell them that they are gambling, staking the safety and independence of the nation on the chances of peace being maintained. If peace is undisturbed the Government will not come under the ban of public opinion, but if we are unfortunate enough to be engaged in a war with a first-class Power, they will have to face a hurricane of popular indignation, in common with all those who have endeavoured to postpone the introduction or passing of such a Bill. I beg to ask the Question standing in my name.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): My Lords, the noble Lord has raised a very important question, and one which, he rightly says, is in no sense a Party one; but I think he will also admit that it is a somewhat delicate question, requiring very careful consideration, and making it very desirable that the Press itself should combine with the Government in regard to any measure that may be introduced. The noble Lord quoted the case of Japan, but I am afraid that in no circumstances would it be possible to introduce such strict secrecy in the West as it was possible to maintain in Eastern waters.

This Question has been under the careful consideration of the Government and of the Defence Committee in co-operation with the Press. In February last a small sub-committee of the Newspaper Society, consisting of Mr. Clifford, Sir Douglas Straight, Sir F. C. Gould, and Mr. Soames, entered into conference with certain members of the Defence Committee with regard to this subject, and they came to something in the shape of an agreement on the basis of which a Bill might probably be drafted. The principal points were these. First, that the publication of all news with regard to naval and military matters or the movements of ships and troops at a time when the Government considered it essential in the interests of the nation to put the Act in operation should be prohibited; but that to this there should be this exception, that there should be no restriction as regards the publication of news supplied from the Admiralty or the War Office, or sent under censorship from the seat of war; and, further, that there should be no restriction upon comment or criticism based upon information furnished as stated or upon facts which were common knowledge. The small committee thought they had not sufficient authority, and the question was referred to a conference of the Newspaper Society which met on June 21st. At that Conference the following Resolutions were carried—

"That this meeting cordially approves the action which has been taken by the Newspaper Society in appointing a sub-committee to confer with the Committee of Imperial Defence in regard to the principles that should govern any legislation dealing with the dissemination of news in time of war and when war is imminent, and authorises the sub-committee of the Newspaper Society to add to its members and to continue to act and to consider any Bill that may be drafted on the subject;"

and—

"That the conclusions of the sub-committee be submitted to a future Conference before the Bill is introduced into Parliament."

Those conferences and that consideration are going on and will go on. The subject is not being disregarded by His Majesty's Government. They are anxious to deal with it in a way that will be both good for the country and satisfactory to the Press, and I may add that only a fortnight ago the Prime Minister in another place said the subject would be dealt with early next session.

***EARL CAWDOR**: My Lords, I am sure your Lordships are indebted to the noble Lord for raising this important question, which he has brought up on several previous occasions. The question was before the Admiralty last year, and I am glad to hear that some progress has been made in the direction in which we hope this discussion may eventually lead. I agree that the question is a delicate one, and requires careful handling; and we are most anxious that any action taken in this

House or in another place should be taken with the concurrence of the Press. I do not mean a necessarily unanimous Press. As long as the majority of the Press are on our side, and there is a general friendly feeling towards a Bill of this kind, I hope His Majesty's Government will strike while the iron is hot. It would be a mistake if the matter were allowed to drop. It ought to be followed up closely till some settlement is arrived at. I think the Press seem to have taken a very reasonable view in the report of the committee which the noble Lord has mentioned. It appears to me, as far as I was able to follow the noble Lord, that what they are asking for is a very reasonable arrangement indeed. I can assure my noble friend that we who sit on this side of the House will do whatever we can to assist legislation of this kind. I again urge the Government not to let the matter drop, but to follow up the progress already made with the assent of the Press, and I hope that before long a satisfactory issue will be reached.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Five o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 13*th July*, 1906.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Cardiff Gas Bill. Lords Amendments to be considered upon Monday next.

Cheltenham Gas Bill; Huddersfield Corporation Bill; London and South Western Railway Bill; London County Buildings Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Manchester Corporation Bill. Lords Amendments to be considered upon Monday next.

Metropolitan Water Board Bill; North East London Railway Bill; Peterborough Gas Bill. Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Newport Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Devon, &c.) Bill [Lords]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Kesteven, &c.) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to—Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill, without Amendment.

Amendments to—Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railways Bill [Lords].

Newtownards Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the law respecting Appeals in Criminal Cases." [Criminal Appeal Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm a Provisional Order under The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Glasgow and South Western Railway. [Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to make further provisions for the management of the English and Welsh estates devised by the Trust Disposition and Settlement of John Patrick Crichton Stuart, Marquess of Bute, deceased." [Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [Lords.]

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and ordered, under Section 9 of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 308.]

Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; From Doveridge; East Coker; Gunnersbury; Horsley Woodhouse; South Stainley; Stapenhill; and, Watford; to lie upon the Table.

LAND VALUES TAXATION, ETC. (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Two Petitions from Partick, against; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petition from London and other places, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petition from Hednesford, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA (CONSTITUTIONS OF THE TRANSVAAL AND ORANGE RIVER COLONIES).

Petition from Cape Colony, for enfranchisement of the coloured races; to lie upon the Table.

VAGRANT CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from Chard, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address July 9th; *Mr. Herbert Samuel*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed, [No. 255.]

EGYPT (No. 2, 1906).

Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the Turco-Egyptian Frontier in the Sinai Peninsula (with a Map) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. Volumes I., II., and III., Minutes of Evidence. Volume IV., Index and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

IMPERIAL REVENUE (COLLECTION AND EXPENDITURE) (GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered May 22nd; *Mr. John Robertson*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 256.]

INCLOSURES (COUNTY OF SURREY).

Return ordered, "Showing (1) the number of Inclosures of common land made under the Inclosure Acts from 1845 to 1899 in the county of Surrey; (2) list of parishes within which such lands are wholly or partly situate; (3) total acreage of such Inclosures; (4) average acreage of such Inclosures."—(*Mr. Marnham.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

National Physical Laboratory.

SIR BENJAMIN STONE (Birmingham, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that commercial, mechanical, and physical tests, such as the determination of the tensile and compressive strength of structural materials, the determination of the electrical conductivity of materials, the determination of melting points of solids and liquids, the determination of the calorific value of fuels, and the photomicrographical examination of metals and alloys, are being undertaken at the National Physical Laboratory, or are included in the circular of charges of the laboratory; that, under the heading of testing of materials of construction, they offer to test shafts, joints, ropes, and chains; and, if so, whether such competition with private practitioners will be stopped, in view of the recommendations of the Treasury Committee in 1898, that it would neither be necessary nor desirable to compete with or interfere with the testing of materials of various kinds as now carried out in private or other laboratories.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The National Physical Laboratory was established as a public institution for standardising and verifying instruments, for testing materials, and for the determination of physical constants. The mechanical and physical tests referred to in the Question form part of the work of such an institution and were contemplated when it was founded. The last sentence of the Question is not one of the recommendations of the Report of 1898, but is taken from Clause 9 and should be read in connection with the rest of the Report, which clearly contemplates such tests. The Committee have always borne in mind the desirability of not interfering with work which is or can be satisfactorily done outside the laboratory; but there is considerable difficulty in laying down a precise definition of the classes of work which may properly be undertaken by the laboratory. I am, however, in communication with the Royal Society on the subject, with the view of ascertaining whether the existing regulations require amendment.

SIR BENJAMIN STONE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether commercial tests of any kind (with the exception of the standardisation of instruments) have been or are being undertaken for private firms or individuals or public companies at the National Physical Laboratory; and whether the full and complete results of all such tests (with the exception of the standardisation of instruments), which may have been undertaken for private firms or individuals or public companies, have been published.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Mechanical and physical tests are undertaken for private firms at the National Physical Laboratory. The general practice has been in cases in which the results appear likely to be of scientific interest to ask permission to publish before undertaking the work; and in no case has permission been refused. The point shall be considered in connection with the other matters referred to in the Answer to the preceding Question.

Raiding of Warehouse of Messrs. Jaffe & Company, of Manchester.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the warehouse of Messrs. Jaffe & Company, of Manchester, was recently raided in the night time by ex-Superintendent M'Kenzie and Inspector Vaughan, while a police sergeant and constable kept watch outside; will he say whether this was done under the direction of the chief constable; whether anything of an incriminating nature was found; whether a search warrant had been obtained; and what explanation is forthcoming as to the action of the police.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I understand that the incident in question occurred more than seven years ago, and was the subject of an informal arbitration by his honour Judge Barry, whose decision was accepted by all the parties concerned. In any case, the Home Secretary has no responsibility in the matter, as the Watch Committee is the police authority for Manchester.

Police and Cab Loitering.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that James Scott, cab proprietor, Pakenham Street, Gray's Inn Road, was fined 2s. 6d. and his licence endorsed, on July 6th, at the Marlborough Police Court, for the driver causing obstruction when, having returned from a long drive, he walked his horse a short distance along Piccadilly; and whether he can take any steps to secure that the police shall show more consideration in future for cabmen.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) It is not the case that James Scott, a cab proprietor, was fined and his licence endorsed in the circumstances stated, but a driver employed by him was convicted and fined for loitering in Piccadilly, after having ignored a caution given him by the constable on duty. Every consideration is extended by the police to cabmen, but it is absolutely necessary, if the traffic of London is to be kept in motion at all, that the regulations should be strictly observed in congested streets like Piccadilly. The general question is under the consideration of the Select Committee on Cabs.

Newspaper Distribution by Cyclists.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will call the attention of the Commissioner of Police to the reckless way in which cyclists distributing newspapers ride in the streets of London; and whether he will give directions that this traffic shall be regulated in such a way as to consult the safety and comfort of pedestrians using the thoroughfares.

(*Answered by Mr Secretary Gladstone.*) I have called for Reports from the police upon this matter, and when I have received them I will give it my careful consideration.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland).

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Great Northern Railway is the only railway in Ireland which refuses to take third-class passengers on mail trains; and whether, in view of the inconvenience thus caused to Irish business men, he will make representations to the railway company on the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) I have communicated with the railway company on the subject of the hon. Member's Question, and am informed that they do carry cross-channel third-class passengers, holding through tickets, on the mail trains to and from Kingstown. The company add that local third-class passengers are not carried on the mail train, but a through train is run following each of the mail trains within thirty minutes by which such passengers can travel, and they explain that their object in not carrying local third-class passengers on mail trains is that the punctual working of the mails may be maintained.

MR. MACVEAGH: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the attention of the Great Northern Railway Company of Ireland will be directed to the total lack of sanitary accommodation on many of their long distance trains including, amongst others, the train leaving Bundoran at 7.20 a.m., arriving at Dundalk at noon.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) I have communicated the hon. Member's Question to the railway company, and have received a reply of which I am sending him a copy.

Education Bill—Compensation for Teachers Discharged.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether the only compensation secured to any teacher in a voluntary school who may lose his employment through the passing of the Education Bill would be that secured to him under Clause 7 (4), by which clause he is entitled to continue contributions to the deferred annuity fund for six months longer than he would in any case be entitled to do under the rules now in force in pursuance of the Superannuation Act of 1898.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Answer is in the affirmative, but I think that the Government will alter the six months to thirty months. If any reasonable scheme can be devised in the future to mitigate the difficulty the Government will give it their friendly consideration.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.)

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs) moved:—"That until and including August 4th Government business be not interrupted under the provisions of any standing order regulating the sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed; that at the conclusion of Government business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that no Motions be made to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11." He did not know whether any serious objection would be taken to this Motion. It might perhaps be said that it was made too early in the session, but he did not think that according to precedent that was so. As he mentioned the other day, the session began rather later than usual, and it was proposed to finish this portion of the session rather earlier than usual; but apart from that, although for the last four years the Motion had been taken on an average nearer the end of the session, yet for the previous four years it was taken twenty-four days before the end, and it was now twenty-one days before the proposed adjournment. On the small point of precedent, then, there was not much to be said. No doubt Members would be anxious to know what use the Government proposed to make of the extended powers they were seeking. The Bills they proposed to deal with were mostly departmental Bills, or at all events non-contentious, non-party measures. He knew the fallacy lurking under the expression non-contentious, but he gave a general indication when he mentioned such Bills as Plural Voting—as an example to the contrary—or the Merchant Shipping Bill, or the Workmen's Compensation Bill; these were not Bills to which the attention of the House would be directed during the remaining weeks of this part of the session. Several of the Bills to be dealt with were legacies from the late Government, and from these it might be assumed the venom of contention was withdrawn; and another Bill included among those with which the Government wished to proceed had the distinction of being backed by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition—the Musical Copyright Bill. The object was by a little extra overtime to secure the passing of some useful measures. He would give the list of these measures. The Government did not limit themselves to this list; there might be other Bills of the same character which they would proceed with. First, there were routine and departmental Bills, the Post Office Sites Bill, the Isle of Man Customs Bill, the Statute Law Revision (Scotland) Bill, the Open Spaces Bill, the Dean Forest Bill, the Crown Lands Bill, the Charitable Loan Societies (Ireland) Bill, the Marriage with Foreigners Bill, the Infectious Diseases (Ireland) Bill, the Wireless Telegraphy Bill, and the Land Tax Commissioners Bill. These were Bills which would meet with the approval of the vast majority of the House. Then there were non-party Bills which had been through Grand Committee. There were three commercial Bills of considerable importance, the Marine Insurance Bill, the Prevention of Corruption Bill, and the Bills of Exchange Act Amendment Bill. There were two agricultural Bills, the Dogs Bill, and the Fertilizers and Feeding Stuffs Bill; and there were also the Fatal Accidents (Scotland) Bill and the Labourers (Ireland) Bill. The only Bills which remained on his list were the Musical Copyright Bill, the Revenue Bill, the Colonial Marriages Bill, the Judicature (Ireland) Bill, the Trade Disputes Bill (which he admitted was of a somewhat different character, but it was quite understood that it would be taken before this portion of the session terminated), the Public Trustee Bill, and the Street Betting Bill, a most useful measure which had come down from the House of Lords, and which the Government had adopted as their own. There might possibly be two or three other minor measures of a similar kind. It would be a distinct addition to the useful work of the session if they were able to pass these measures in the few days that remained before the adjournment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, until and including August 4th, Government Business be not interrupted under the Provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed; that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that no Motions be made to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said there were some portions of the right hon. Gentleman's brief statement to which he did not take exception. But he thought the right hon. Gentleman had quite misunderstood the present position of business, and the parallel he had drawn between the present session and previous sessions was wholly misleading. If he really was going to ask the House to spend the time remaining to them before the adjournment in doing work other than that of Supply and the Education Bill, he would be violating the spirit and the letter of the understanding that was come to upon an earlier occasion. ["No."] He raised no strong objection to the Government's taking Bills which did not divide parties or excite general opposition. But if the right hon. Gentleman was going to take a measure of the first importance like the Trade Disputes Bill in the small hours of the morning in July he asked the House to consider whether that was a reasonable proposal. It would be unreasonable in any circumstances; it was grotesquely unreasonable when they had an autumn session before them. They had not had a clear authoritative statement as to how the time of the autumn session was to be occupied. It was true that the Trade Disputes Bill passed its second reading without a division, and no one denied that it dealt with a subject that ought to be dealt with, for the existing state of the law could not and ought not to be allowed to continue. But the Government had two different and inconsistent solutions of the question, and they required very full consideration on the part of the House. The Bill dealt with the interests of the great trade unions, the general conditions of industry in this country, and the relations between employers and employed. With an autumn session before them, this was not a proper Bill to be taken in the small hours of the morning. Apart from the merits of these Bills, he submitted that the time at the disposal of the House ought to be devoted to Supply and the Education Bill. The Government had followed the single precedent of last year by giving only twenty days to Supply instead of the maximum of twenty-three which the Supply Rule permitted. Last year when the late Government gave only twenty days to Supply what course did the Prime Minister pursue? He did his best by Questions across the floor of the House to protest against such a limitation of discussion in Committee of Supply. Not only so, but the right hon. Gentleman moved that twenty-three days be given instead of twenty. The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster told them ten months ago that the Supply Rule had broken down because within twenty-three days they could not get through an adequate discussion of Supply, and now the same right hon. Gentleman was a party to restricting discussion in Supply to twenty days. He had not felt disposed to raise violent objection to this restriction this session until he learned the course the Government intended to pursue with regard to the Army Estimates, because he recognised that the Estimates were in the main the Estimates of the late Government. But the discussions in Supply were not mainly discussions on particular financial proposals; they afforded the great opportunity which the House had of criticising the administration of the Government. There were great needs of criticism which the Government had brought upon themselves. One related to South Africa and the other to the Army. There were questions of the utmost importance connected with the new Constitution of the Transvaal, which could only be discussed, as far as he knew, on the Estimates. They constituted a great claim for additional time. Since last night a new necessity had been thrown upon the House for commenting upon the great proposals made by the Minister for War. The Secretary of State made two able and interesting speeches which occupied three hours and ten minutes. He did not believe that the right hon. Gentleman could have made them any shorter. He granted that, and it was part of his case. Of the time occupied by the whole debate less than two hours were occupied by Members of the Opposition.

Mr. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): There were only three of you present part of the time.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said that so long as the Government were of opinion that Members could devote themselves to dinner and debate at the same time that phenomenon would often repeat itself. But the fact remained that of the single night given up to the exposition and discussion of a plan of Army change, which involved the destruction of ten battalions as well as other important alterations, only two hours were allowed to the Opposition for expressing their views. Could anyone say there was a Parliamentary precedent for such a restriction of liberty of debate as that implied?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The statement of policy of my right hon. friend had nothing whatever to do with this year's Estimates. It was a statement of his prospective policy, which it was thought respectful to the House to make at this early period, in order that they might have the whole autumn to examine and familiarise themselves with it and criticise it when the time comes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman's interruption filled him with greater surprise than he had before, and he would tell the House why. The right hon. Gentleman was not present last night when an earnest appeal was made for more time. They asked for time in the autumn. They recognised that it was difficult, if not impossible, for the Government to find time at a reasonable hour in the evening before separating in August, and what they humbly put in a request for was that they should have an opportunity of considering and commenting upon the plans of the Secretary of State for War before the right hon. Gentleman carried out his scheme or took such steps as would prevent him from withdrawing it. If the Prime Minister meant, by his very courteous interruption, that they should have time to consider the scheme in the privacy of their own chambers, in quiet meditation, or to prepare their speeches for next year's Estimates, of what use was that for attacking the scheme if they thought it to be wrong or of modifying it if they could persuade the Secretary of State that it required modification? If the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to give in the autumn such privileges as the late Government invariably gave when great Army changes were suggested, he would not say another word on the subject of the Army Estimates.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think it is very likely that, if the right hon. Gentleman and his friends wish to sit a day or two longer than they otherwise would have to do in the autumn session, we might afford them an opportunity of doing so. I think it is reasonable that a certain amount of intellectual steam should be let off on the proposals.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not quite know what the right hon. Gentleman means by intellectual steam. If that is his polite way of describing a debate in this House——

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I thought steam was a motive power?

MR A. J. BALFOUR: Not when it is let off. I understand that the right hon. Gentleman is prepared to give us days for this discussion?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: A day. ["Oh."]

MR. A. J. BALFOUR thought that one day was neither in accordance with precedent nor with the necessities of the case. One day was better than nothing, but he earnestly trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to give more than that. But, at all events, let that opportunity, whether it was one day or more, be before the Government were really committed to the work of destruction, as he and his hon. friends thought—of change, as all must admit—which was adumbrated in the speeches of the Secretary of State for War yesterday. So much for Supply. Now he turned to the Education Bill. It would not be in order to dwell on the insufficency of the time given to this Bill, except by way of a premiss to the conclusion that if there was more time it ought to be given to the Education Bill. Let him remind the right hon. Gentleman of what he considered the Parliamentary pledge which was given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer during the debate on the closure resolution. In reply to a question put by himself, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that they must be up by August 4th, and that if they were to be up by that date, with the exception of three Fridays, the Government were prepared to give the whole time between then and the date stated to the Education Bill and the necessary business of Supply, and he added that two of the Fridays were private Members' Fridays, and that the third Friday would be devoted, it might be to the Trade Disputes Bill or to some other Bill—he was not in a position to say which. That was a statement made argumentatively in order to show that the Government, however desirous of giving more time for the Education Bill, could not do so. The letter of that pledge would prevent their even carrying those small administrative and uncontroversial Bills to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred. He did not press them to keep that part of the pledge. He did not for a moment desire to exact the strict letter of the law and have his pound of flesh. But he was quite unable to see how the Government, in face of the pledge of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, could make such a proposition as that of using the time after 11 o'clock for such a measure as the Trade Disputes Bill. He did not know what the views of the Labour Party might be. No doubt they were anxious to have the Bill, but he could not believe that they would desire that the measure, the importance of which they would be the first to recognise, should be passed through the House without adequate discussion. He did not think that by trying to force on the discussion of such a measure after 11 o'clock the Government would make much progress. They would certainly arouse an unnecessary bitterness of feeling on a Bill which deserved full and fair discussion, and which ought in no sense to be made the battleground of parties.

*MR. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough): Why not discuss it after 11 o'clock on its merits?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that if they were not competent to discuss Supply after 11 o'clock they were not competent to discuss the Trade Disputes Bill after 11 o'clock. He was not in the House at the time, but he understood that the Labour Members most earnestly pressed the Government to restrict the hours of debate to 11 o'clock; and the very gentlemen who now wished to discuss the Trade Disputes Bill after 11 o'clock were those from whom the 11 o'clock rule was devised. The Government had wasted many days this session during which they might have got on with this measure. [An HON. MEMBER: What days?] Well, they spent two days over a fiscal resolution which they could not explain, and they spent another day over a minute analysis of the wit of a learned Judge. There were three days which might have been better spent on the Trade Disputes Bill. After 11 o'clock the House was not nearly so well qualified to deal with controversial subjects. He hoped the Government would feel that he had made out a case. He did not raise objections to the uncontroversial Bills; but considering that only twenty days instead of twenty-three had been given to Supply, and that in the Education Bill they were dealing with a vastly controversial measure under a system which did not enable them to discuss half the Bill, he must say that the Government were precluded from dealing with such subjects as the Trade Disputes Bill after 11 o'clock. Small Bills if they liked; but it was not in the interests of the House that the right hon. Gentleman should use his great majority in order to pass such important measures as the Trade Disputes Bill at inconvenient hours in the morning.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said he did not know that he was in order in again rising, but he asked leave to make some explanations which he hoped would disarm some of the criticisms of the right hon. Gentleman. After all, the strong point in his objection to the proposal of the Government was the position given to the Trade Disputes Bill. But the Government did not intend to take more than the Committee stage of the Trade Disputes Bill before the House adjourned, and their intention was to take that on a Friday between 5 and 11 o'clock. In that way there would be time for the discussion of the really one point in that Bill which excited strong feeling. The Report stage and the Third Reading would be taken during the autumn session, during which those who had taken strong views on the subject would have an opportunity of expressing them. Then the right hon. Gentleman complained of the comparatively small amount of time given to Supply. But how did they stand in regard to the amount of Supply that had been taken this year?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not refer to money, but to policy.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that none the less money was of material importance in this matter. He found that this year at the end of the fourteenth allotted day 71 per cent. of the whole sum involved had been passed, whereas in 1905 at the end of the eighteenth day only 61 per cent. had been passed, and in 1904 at the same time only 55 per cent. had been discussed. They did not stand badly, therefore, in that matter this session. As to the Army Estimates and Army questions generally, five days had been given to them this session, so that there again there was no ground for complaint. The right hon. Gentleman had quoted the Chancellor of the Exchequer as saying that the time of the House up to the adjournment would be given either to the Education Bill or to Supply, with certain exceptions. Well, that was true. The time of the House according to the Standing Orders of the House, would be so devoted ["Oh!"] but now they asked for the suspension of those Orders in order to find time for certain other uncontentious, departmental, useful measures which they thought the House ought to pass. He thought that was a complete answer to the whole case of the right hon. Gentleman, and they would be prepared to leave a certain opportunity for the discussion of the great Army question in the autumn session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he now understood the right hon. Gentleman to promise that they should have an opportunity of discussing the Army scheme before the Government were absolutely committed to the practical steps of that scheme.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN was understood to dissent and to say that the Secretary of State had already stated that he could not consent to refrain from action until his project had been further discussed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that at any rate he hoped there would be no attempt to take the Trade Disputes Bill after eleven o'clock.

MR. LAWRENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) asked for information as to whether the Government intended to bring in any new Bill. He thought they ought to receive an assurance that no new Government Bill of an important character would be introduced at this period of the session or in the autumn session. The right hon. Gentleman had made reference to some Bill of the first rank as being free from controversy, and as being legacies from the late Government. There was one in which he was personally interested, viz., the Dogs Bill. He hoped that every opportunity would be given to get that Bill passed, although it had met with considerable opposition on the Ministerial side of the House. He thought that everybody would admit that the discussion which they had had in regard to Clause 4 of the Education Bill was one which was justified and one which was likely to be properly renewed upon Report. He thought they would also be justified in asking the Government whether they could take it that no further public Bills would be introduced, and that they would not take such Bills on Supply days. They ought also to know what the business of the autumn session was.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN asked the indulgence of the House in order to explain two things. There was a little ambiguity in regard to the word "steps" and he did not want there to be any misunderstanding. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that he understood that there would be no "steps" taken for carrying out the policy of the Secretary of State for War until the autumn session. He did not know what the right hon. Gentleman meant by "steps," and, as his right hon. friend the Minister for War said yesterday, he could not restrict himself in regard to taking steps in the matter. Therefore he did not think they could at all admit that he was restricted in this matter. He trusted that the opportunity that would be given would be in time for the enforcement so far as it could be enforced of the general criticism of the right hon. Gentleman. To talk plainly upon the matter, in the case of the reduction of some battalions, some steps might be taken, and he could not promise that they would not be taken. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down made a great point of nothing being taken except Supply on Thursdays and Supply nights when overtime was worked. He found, however, that in 1900 ten Bills were proceeded with after this Motion was carried; in 1901 four Bills; in 1902 nine Bills; in 1903 four Bills, and in the next year he thought five Bills. Some of these were highly contentious measures.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not rise to deal with the question which the right hon. Gentleman had raised. Indeed he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman's statement. He wished to call attention to another matter. The right hon. Gentleman now said that he could not pledge himself that something would not be done by the Secretary of State for War before the autumn sittings. Rumours had reached him that something had already been done before the House heard the scheme. He would not be in order in complaining of that now, but on another occasion he would complain of it seriously. He merely rose to express the hope that as little as possible would be done before the House had had an opportunity of considering the whole question, and that that opportunity would be given as early as possible in the autumn session.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said he did not understand what the right hon. Gentleman meant by "as little as possible." It was very undesirable that an undertaking should be given in any vague terms, as there might be a dispute afterwards as to its meaning. He therefore thought they must leave themselves free.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said that, as one who had strongly advocated the new Rules under which the House rose at eleven o'clock, he wished to give unqualified approval to the proposals which the Government were now making. He trusted that the Resolution would meet with the general support of the House. He would remind hon. Members, especially on the Opposition side of the House, that the discussion of the Trade Disputes Bill certainly need not occupy any great amount of time. The Bill had been discussed so often and the principle of the new clause was accepted unanimously by the House upon the Second Reading. Prolonged discussion therefore did not seem to be necessary, as the only point remaining to be decided was the words which would best secure the carrying out of the intentions of Parliament to give protection to trade unions. That being so the time offered by the Government with reasonable limitations as to the length of speeches and in regard to repetitions, would be amply sufficient for the purpose of enabling that measure to pass.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Norwich) asked what the effect of this Motion would be in regard to private business, both opposed and unopposed. He did not understand that there was any intention to interfere with private business.

*MR. SPEAKER said he did not think that private business would be interfered with by this Resolution. If private business was unopposed it would be taken first, but if it was opposed it would have to come on at such time as the Chairman of Ways and Means might fix. Of course if it happened upon a day allocated to the Education Bill it would have to be taken after half past ten after the closure was concluded. If the private business came upon a Supply day it would be taken at a quarter past eight o'clock.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon) said the Secretary of State had told the House that he was going to take them fully into his confidence as to these changes in the Army. He now said he was going to destroy ten battalions of the Regular Army, and these battalions consisted of 3,000 men belonging to the regular artillery. The right hon. Gentleman was about to break up the Militia garrison artillery; to destroy the Royal Arsenal Volunteers and to make other changes of very great magnitude which when once made could not possibly be repaired. Were they to understand, in view of the statement of the Secretary for War that he was going to take them fully into his confidence, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer considered it a compliance with that pledge that before one of these very important details had been discussed in the House he was going to make the whole of the changes?

MR. ASQUITH said he had only repeated what the Secretary for War had said that he could not be limited in this matter.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked whether he was correct in understanding that the reduction of the Army was going to take place without further consultation with the House of Commons. [OPPOSITION cries of "Yes."] Were they to have no opportunity of discussing the matter?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the Secretary of State for War was perfectly entitled to take any steps upon his own responsibility without consulting individual Members of the House of Commons.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT inquired if the right hon. Gentleman could disband the whole Army upon his own responsibility? If he was entitled to disband 20,000 men without consulting the House of Commons he supposed he could disband the entire force.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN asked if the hon. and gallant Member supposed that 20,000 men could be disbanded from the Army between now and the months of October or November.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London) inquired whether the Prime Minister thought that in pursuing that policy he was restoring the supremacy of the House of Commons which was said to be one of the mandates received by the Liberal Party at the General Election.

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That, until and including August 4th, Government Business be not interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, and may be entered upon at any hour though opposed; that at the conclusion of Government Business each day Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put; and that no Motions be made to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11.—(*Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman*).

LABOURERS (IRELAND) [ADVANCES].

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the repayment to the Ireland Development Grant, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of such annual sum as may be advanced out of that fund, in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Law relating to Labourers in Ireland, and to make provision with respect to the application of portion of the Ireland Development Grant.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next.

WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY BILL.

Order for Consideration of the Lords' Amendment read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Lords' Amendment be now considered."

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said that in his opinion, the Bill was of much greater importance than appeared on the face of it three or four months ago when it was first before the House. Since that time various new facts had come to light in regard to this question of wireless telegraphy, and he was anxious to submit certain points upon the subject to the Postmaster-General. Since the Bill was hurriedly passed in the first few days of the session, the facts which had come out threw a different complexion upon the attitude of the Government. In the first place the Admiralty had responded to a request and had published its agreement with the Marconi Company, and the Postmaster-General had given a statement as to the licenses in vogue under the Act of 1904. They had, moreover, had the advantage of hearing the views of Lloyds Shipping Company and other commercial concerns which were vitally interested in the subject. The character of the Bill had been changed three times, and the measure had been materially altered in the course of its discussion here and in another place. He was convinced that if it passed as it now stood very serious danger would be involved, not only to this country but to the commercial interests of the world generally. The Bill continued for a third period of three years what was virtually a monopoly to a private company, and the Marconi Company would under it receive a position of complete supremacy in this country although a great deal of progress had been made since they first started. There were now other companies in the field whose apparatus, he was told by scientists, was as efficient from the telegraphic point of view as that of the Marconi Company. The Indian Government had adopted a system which was working with extraordinary success.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): Nothing of the kind.

Lord BALCARRES said his information upon the matter was that the system was working with success.

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON: I know it is not so.

Lord BALCARRES said that had he known that the debate on taking the time of the House would have concluded so early he would have provided himself with the official statements of the Bluebook in which it was stated in black and white that the system adopted by the Indian Government had been carried on with great success. That was one of the new facts which had arisen since the Bill was in Committee in this House, and he did not like the idea of this monopoly being carried on for another three years, especially in view of the fact that at the present moment the company was trying to bring litigation before the Courts in order to establish the validity of its patents. He suggested that three years was too long an extension of time to give to the Wireless Telegraphy Act of 1904. The Act had only been in force for two years and science had revolutionised the whole system of wireless telegraphy and in the next three years the result might be still more marked. Therefore he thought it was unwise on the part of the Government to tie their hands for too long a period. There were good reasons from another point of view why this should not be done. In three or four months time an international congress was to be held to consider the whole question. Why should they tie the hands of the British Government a few months before the congress took place? Let them wait until the congress was over and the litigation had taken place and they saw whether the Marconi or the Forrest patents were the correct patents before they tied their hands for another three years. He ventured to suggest to the Prime Minister that no harm could possibly be done by including the present Act in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill for one year; that it would give the competing companies time to fight out their quarrels in the Law Courts and enable the Government to discuss the whole matter in the conference without being tied down to a particular system. He moved that the Lords' Amendments be considered this day three months.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr HENNIKER HEATON said he was a little astonished at the line taken by his noble friend considering that the agreement was originally made and forced upon the country by a Government of which his noble friend was a member.

Viscount TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) called attention to the fact that forty Members were not present.

The House was counted, and forty Members being present,

Mr. HENNIKER HEATON said the Marconi agreement had been approved by the late Government and by this House. He himself had no interest in the Marconi Company and cared very little which side won in the litigation which might take place. But the facts were these. If the present agreement was thrown out, the Marconi Company would be placed in a better position, and he had authority for saying that they would rather welcome the defeat of the Bill. The Bill really protected the interests of the Postmaster-General and the Government, and had nothing to do with monopoly. The Marconi Company under this Bill enjoyed no monopoly whatever.

*MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire) said that on a previous occasion he gave his reasons for objecting to this Bill and those reasons applied with still greater force to the original Act of 1904. He pointed out that the responsibility for the Act of 1904, or the continuance of it, so far as it created a monopoly—and it did—really rested with the late Government, of which the noble Lord was a Member. Another point the noble Lord did not allude to was this. Although he mentioned the Admiralty agreement, he made no mention of the agreement between the Postmaster-General and the Marconi Telegraph Companies concluded on August 11, 1904. It seemed to him that that agreement must be read with the Act, which was contemporaneous with it. That agreement, which was made at the time when the Act was passed, gave very great powers and privileges to the Marconi Companies. If it did not give them a monopoly, it at least gave them a very strong preference over any other competitors who might undertake wireless work, and must, if developed, prove a serious barrier to the progress of wireless telegraphy. The noble Lord had said it was unwise to tie our hands for too long a time. What had the late Government done in that respect? The first and master patent of the Marconi Companies would expire in 1910, but by that agreement made with them on behalf of the late Government, the privileges given to the Companies were to extend to 1919, so that these preferences were extended to a term of nine years after the expiry of their master patent. British patents, moreover, did not extend to the Channel Islands, but the privileges granted to the company under the agreement extended to those islands. This agreement, which had been entered into by the late Government, was one of the most improvident that any Government had ever made. More than eighteen months passed after it had been entered into before it was brought before the House, and the House had to thank the present Postmaster-General for making it public. Had it not been for the right hon. Gentleman they would never have known what the agreement contained. He asked his right hon. friend to bear in mind how much the hands of the Post Office were tied in this matter. He reminded the House that the Act of 1894 had been passed on the plea of national defence, but by the operation of the agreement it had become to no small extent a source of profit of a private company instead of the country. That he considered was very regrettable. No doubt his right hon. friend would bear all these matters in mind when the international conference on wireless telegraphy took place, and he would no doubt be in a position later to afford the House ample opportunity for discussion when the question came before the House again. They might in future see some modifications of the measure designed to promote wireless telegraphy and extend its usefulness in every way for the benefit of the country.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said the noble Lord seemed to assume that he (Mr. Buxton) was forcing on this Bill contrary to the general feeling of the House, but he must point out that the Bill was only carrying out the policy of the late Government with regard to this matter, which was the putting of wireless telegraphy under the control of the Postmaster-General. It was necessary that the measure should be extended for three years because the subject was now under a great process of expansion, and also owing to the meeting of an international conference which he hoped would make a considerable alteration in the basis upon which these questions had been placed. But it was necessary, in order to maintain the present position, that this Bill should be passed for a limited period. In three years the Government then in power would have to deal with the question on a larger basis. The real object of the Bill was to enable the Postmaster-General to maintain some control over the system of wireless telegraphy, and it was not intended through it to give a monopoly to any one company. He intended to do his best to encourage all the varied forms of wireless telegraphy, so that the country might have an opportunity of making experiments with reference to its use, and thus in the end to be able to adopt the best system.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said he was glad to hear the statement of the Postmaster-General that he did not propose to give a monopoly to any company. He did not see why the Government should have any control over wireless telegraphy in times of peace. In time of war, of course, all the rules of commerce were in abeyance. It was not to be supposed that in time of war the Government would allow any telegraphic signals to go to and from the country except such as they desired. That, however, was no reason why the Government should control wireless telegraphy to-day. Another invention of great hope and promise, the telephone, had retarded to a very unfortunate extent, and was still because the Post Office had monopolised it. Any attempt on the part of science or of enterprise to come between the Post Office and its monopoly was ruthlessly "squashed."

LORD BALCARRES: On the assurance of the Postmaster-General that his policy is actively to encourage all forms of wireless telegraphy I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

LORD BALCARRES asked whether, as there was to be an International Conference in October, and very important litigation was pending between several companies, it was not possible, instead of passing this Bill for three years, to put it into the Expiring Laws Continuance Act for twelve months? By the end of a year litigation would probably be completed, and the Conference, he presumed, would have been held. The position of the companies would have become much more clearly defined after the litigation, and the position of the Government would be made clear both in relation to the wireless telegraph companies and, what was still more important, in relation to the Governments who were represented at the International Conference.

Mr. Sydney Buxton.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he was afraid he could not accept the suggestion, and he thought on the noble Lord's own argument it would be a mistake if he did so. If they once got an Act into the Expiring Laws Continuance Act it was likely to continue there. The objects of the noble Lord would be better secured by passing an Act for three years, at the end of which period the question must be considered by the Government of the day. If it should be thought necessary to move in the matter before the end of three years there was nothing to prevent their doing so. If necessary the Government could introduce a Bill with regard to any question whether there was an Act on the Statute Book or not. The noble Lord was very sanguine if he thought the litigation was likely to be completed in twelve months. Litigation in respect of wireless telegraphy had continued since the commencement of its invention, and was likely to last for all time. He hoped under the circumstances the noble Lord would not press his objection.

Question put, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906–7.

CLASS II.

On the Order of the Day being read, there was a short pause, the Deputy-Chairman not having the necessary Papers to proceed with the Votes.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) moved to report progress and ask leave to sit again owing to the extraordinary position in which he said the Government were in in not having got the Papers of what was really the first business, the Bills which had so far occupied the attention of the House having been very small matters.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir Frederick Banbury.*)

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON hoped the hon. Gentleman would not press this Motion. It was a pure accident that the Paper on which they had to proceed had not arrived, the reason being that they had got through the business with exceptional rapidity. When the hon. Member for the City was re-elected to this House they hardly expected that they would get through the business so quickly. The hon. Gentleman always took so intelligent and so keen an interest in the business of the Government. However, the Paper had now come in.

SIR F. BANBURY said he would withdraw his Motion, but he might be allowed to say that only a few moments before the right hon. Gentleman himself had said that the Opposition were doing the right thing in obstructing the Government. If he had ever been guilty of such a proceeding, which he did not admit, he had only been following the example of the right hon. Gentleman.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £75,335 be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) congratulated the hon. Baronet on his position as representing the Board of Agriculture, but at the same time he thought the hon. Baronet's feelings of duty to his country must be somewhat harshly mingled with the feeling that the principle which he had always advocated with such zeal in this House had been in his case reversed. On more than one occasion in this House they had had attention called to the fact that if agriculture was to have the real voice which it ought to have as the leading industry in the country, it should be represented in this House by a Minister of Agriculture who was both a Member of this House and a member of the Cabinet. He was sorry to say that right hon. Gentlemen opposite had never followed that principle. The Department of Agriculture was represented in this House by one who was not responsible, who had no power to act on his own account, and who was obliged to refer to another place in any action he might take.

THE CHAIRMAN (MR. EMMOTT, Oldham, who was now in the Chair) said he did not think the question of the appointment of Ministers could be touched on this Vote.

*MR. LAURENCE HARDY said he regretted very much that owing to the absence of the representative of the Board of Agriculture from this House they were constantly being placed in an extremely difficult position with regard to agricultural policy. They had a very good instance of that in the debate that took place earlier in the session upon the importation of foreign cattle. He doubted whether any hon. Member could recall a subject which excited more interest on a private Member's day, and yet there was nobody to answer directly for the Government, though the Board of Agriculture was the only possible authority that could be a judge of the question of foreign disease and the difficulties and risks connected with it. With reference to the Vote before the Committee he would like to ask a few questions of the hon. Baronet upon a subject in which he had always taken great interest, namely, the policy of the Board of Agriculture with reference to various diseases of animals. Strong representations had been made to the President of the Board of Agriculture with regard to glanders and sheep scab, and he hoped they would receive some information upon this point of a definite character. With regard to glanders, the country was in an extremely favourable position provided that the Board of Agriculture could put pressure upon the Treasury. In that case, glanders could be dealt with as effectually as any other disease, because it was found within certain limited areas and arose in very few spots. The local authorities were willing to act and spend money to get rid of these diseases. Glanders was a disease which affected, not only animals, but human beings, and therefore there was all the more reason for putting pressure upon the Treasury to provide funds for the elimination of the disease. With reference to sheep scab they were very much in the same position, although the outlook was more favourable than in former years owing to the strong action of the Department and the Act which had been passed. It was clearly proved that this disease also arose in certain districts. It had been shown that compulsory dipping could be carried out, and he thought that the time had now come for dealing with this matter in a comprehensive manner. The only objection was that people did not like being placed in the scheduled area, but if they had a general regulation, and made no distinction between different parts of the country, nobody would feel any stigma, and they would be able by strong measures to get rid of a disease which had undoubtedly caused a great deal of havoc and considerable annoyance. He was sure the extinction of this disease would be extremely welcome to the agricultural population. A Committee had also reported upon other diseases connected with sheep, although the matter was of a certain technical nature. Nevertheless he felt that the Department was on right lines in permitting scientific inquiries into these diseases. In the past but little had been known about them, and this Committee was throwing a great deal of light upon the subject. The cost of these scientific investigations was not great, and they were content with slow progress because the researches took a long time, but it was necessary that they should go on. They ought not to grudge the expenditure, because a very great advantage was being obtained from these scientific researches, and therefore he hoped that the hon. Baronet would be able to say that they were to be continued. Then there was another subject which came before the Sheep Scab Committee, and that was foot rot, and he thought there might be some inquiry into that question. In asking for further help in favour of agricultural education and for further support to agricultural colleges, he pointed out that there was one institution which had never yet received any State aid, although it was the most valuable institution of its kind—he referred to the Institution for Agricultural Research at Rothamsted—which was carried on with great advantage to agriculture generally. It had a most eminent agriculturist at its head, and it stood in a unique position from its long experimental experience. In order to insure that it should be worthy of the country, he thought the Board of Agriculture ought to see that it did not languish for want of funds, and some consideration should be paid to it to make sure that it would be able to continue its good work. The Board of Agriculture had a good staff and was an excellent department, and they ought not to grudge the funds necessary to keep it going. He hoped they would be assured that the scare and panic about the introduction of foreign disease had been entirely dispersed, and that there was no fear of the Department yielding to the agitation that the flocks and herds of the country were in danger.

*Mr. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said he wished to refer the Report of the Departmental Committee which dealt with preferential rates on railways for agricultural produce. This was a matter which had occupied the attention of agriculturists for a great many years past. Again and again when this Vote had been brought forward the question of preferential railway rates had been discussed, and everybody knew the intense interest the farmers took in the question. It was the usual practice of every Government when in a difficult position to appoint either a Committee or a Royal Commission. This Committee was appointed under such circumstances. He was sorry that its

Report was not more satisfactory, but one thing the investigations of the Committee had proved was that the agricultural community suffered under considerable injustice with regard to the carriage upon agricultural produce.

MR. HOUSTON (Liverpool, W. Toxteth) called attention to the fact that there were not forty Members present.

House counted, and forty Members being present,

*MR. SOARES said it had been asserted that those who advocated a more equitable adjustment of railway rates were in favour of protection, but as a strong free trader he wished to repudiate that suggestion. To his mind, this question of preferential railway rates had nothing to do with protection in any shape or form.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see how this question comes under this Vote.

*MR. SOARES said the Report he was dealing with was issued by a Departmental Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture, and he did not think that upon this point they ought to be accused of being protectionists. All he contended was that when they granted a monopoly, as they did in the case of railway companies, they ought to see that that monopoly did not injure the general community. Special privileges carried with them special rights.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member appears now to be discussing legislation, and that is not in order.

*MR. SOARES said this Departmental Committee accused some of them of pressing for something of a protectionist nature, and all he wished to say was that they were doing nothing of the kind. The Report gave instances of very great grievances to agriculturists. The rate for agricultural home produce from Leith to Glasgow was 7s. 3d., whereas for foreign produce it was only 5s., which showed a clear preference of 2s. 3d. He was aware that the railway companies contended that they were not to blame, but the shipping companies, but he would be able to show that it was the fault of the railway companies. On page 3 of the Report there was the evidence of a Mr. Drysdale, which showed that 70s. per ton was charged for fresh meat and only 45s. per ton for frozen meat on the railway. That could have nothing to do with water carriage, and was a clear instance of preferential rates.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Unless the hon. Member can show that that state of things can be remedied without legislation it will not be in order upon this Estimate.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR said the Report made certain suggestions as to administration, and he contended that it was therefore in order to discuss the railway charges.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said the hon. Member for Barnstaple had made certain allegations which he understood were ruled out of order. He wished to know if he would be in order in answering the allegations which had been made.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Baronet cannot answer what is out of order. So far as the allegations are in order he can answer them.

*MR. SOARES said the Board of Agriculture by closer communication with the Board of Trade and by representation to the Board of Trade Committee could considerably help the farmers in this matter without legislation.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY said that for ten minutes the hon. Member for Barnstaple had been making remarks which conveyed certain imputations upon railway companies. Surely he would be allowed to answer those allegations.

*THE CHAIRMAN: It depends on whether those remarks were out of order. If the hon. Member will bring his observations into line with what has been laid down by the noble Lord and deal with matters that can be dealt with by administration, then he will be in order, but he cannot deal with questions which can only be dealt with by legislation.

*MR. SOARES said he would give an instance which came within his own knowledge in the town of Barnstaple, where the railway companies charged 38s. 4d. per ton from Barnstaple to London as against 17s. 6d. for foreign meat from Southampton to London. The Report also said that the railway companies made a profit of 18s. 4d. per ton by traffic to Barnstaple, whilst they made a profit of 7s. a ton on other traffic. He was aware that that had been denied by the railway company. All he wanted was that the President of the Board of Agriculture should put himself in touch with agriculturists in order to bring these questions forward. The Board of Agriculture had in one case in the past taken the part of the farmers and had brought these matters before the Board of Trade. He wanted the Department in every instance to make it known to the farmers that if they had a grievance of this kind, they should send to the Board of Agriculture and it would be taken up. He thought farmers ought to look upon the Board of Agriculture as a place where they could lay their grievances. If the Board found that a farmer had a grievance in this matter, then they ought to bear the expense of any action which might result from it. The proceedings before the Railway and Canal Commissioners were of a very complicated character. The Report said—

> "The result was that the farmer at Barnstaple who paid 38s. 4d. per ton for 2-ton consignments, or 34s. 2d. per ton for 3-ton consignments, found himself in full competition with a rate of 17s. 6d. per ton on foreign meat from Southampton on the one side and a rate of 25s. per ton from Liverpool on the other."

What the Report practically said was that the farmers ought to combine to send their goods to places where they could be handled more expeditiously. Time and again in these discussions co-operation among farmers had been advocated. He was sure they would all cordially agree in urging the farmers to co-operate. He believed that as time went on, farmers would more and more co-operate with each other in these respects. He was not entitled at present to go into questions of legislation, but he might say that he did not see how agriculturists could be helped in this matter of co-operation without legislation. He sincerely hoped that the Board of Agriculture would in the first place impress upon farmers the advantage of co-operation, and in the next place that they would prove to the farmers throughout the country that they had in the Board a real friend who would take up the question of railway preference rates and fight the battle on their behalf.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR said he regretted that more agriculturists were not present on both sides of the House whilst this debate proceeded. Having regard to the statements made in the discussion of the Land Tenure Bill by hon. Gentlemen opposite that they represented the views of the farmers of the country, he thought they might at least have found it possible to be present to-day in greater numbers. He wished to draw special attention to the findings of the Departmental Committee and to ask the hon. Baronet representing the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries one or two questions in connection with it. First of all, however, he would like to point out that the whole findings of this Departmental Committee on Railway Preferential Rates were really in favour of fiscal reform. Free traders had constantly attacked their opponents in connection with this question, on the ground that agriculture was not so much handicapped by free trade as it was by unfair rates imposed by railway companies. This Committee was appointed to inquire into the very question, and, although he did not altogether agree with its findings, and although he agreed to some extent with the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken that it had not altogether treated agriculturists fairly, still at the same time they must remember that it was a very representative Committee and that its findings said that it was impossible to impose restrictions upon railway companies and cause them to give better rates than at present. Therefore, the whole of the argument of the average free trader, that agriculture was handicapped more by the unfair rates of the railway companies than by anything else, fell to the ground. He would like to refer to the Minority Report of the Committee, signed by Mr. E. G. Haygarth Brown, who, he understood, was at the

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries; and he hoped the hon. Baronet would see his way to carry out some of the suggestions made by that gentleman, because, he ventured to think, his suggestions were, on the whole, more valuable than the findings of the majority. One of the most important suggestions was as follows—

> "In existing circumstances agriculturists have no practical means of ascertaining whether such preference exists in any particular case, and no practical means of testing the question whether such preferential treatment, if it exists, amounts to undue or illegal preference."

That, surely, was a most important point. The average farmer, whether in Sussex or in Devonshire, had no means of finding out whether rates charged were illegal or whether rates showed undue preference or not. The third suggestion made by Mr. Brown was that the Board should obtain, when requested, for the information of agriculturists, particulars of rates for imported traffic and the division of these rates into charges for sea and land traffic and for dock, harbour, shipping, and carting charges. It would be of great value if that suggestion were carried out. At present, in most cases, it was absolutely impossible for farmers to find out these things and to make complaint where undue preference did exist. Another good suggestion was No. 7—that the Board should have power, subject to the sanction of the Treasury, to pay a part or the whole of any expenses incurred in connection with the bringing of cases of alleged preference before the Board of Trade. He did not suppose for a moment that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would agree to that suggestion, or that the Board of Agriculture would be given any money for the purpose, but he thought it would be a good thing if it could be done. The expense of bringing forward these cases of undue preference pressed heavily on the farmers. Another suggestion in Mr. Brown's report was that—

> "A report of the proceedings in such cases before the Board of Trade be laid before the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, and that the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries should report annually to Parliament on all cases of alleged preferential treatment in connection with which they have rendered assistance to agriculturists."

That, again, was a most important recommendation, and one which he hoped the hon. Baronet would see his way to carry out. As the hon. Member for Barnstaple had said, agriculturists were constantly having dinned into their ears that they did not co-operate enough for the purpose of disposing of their produce, or buying what they required. Although he agreed that sometimes they did not co-operate sufficiently, he thought rather unfair accusations were brought against them on this question of co-operation. It was impossible for farmers to make up their produce in very large quantities, and certainly it was impossible for them to forward their produce in the large quantities which came from the ports. It was only in accordance with common sense to suppose that produce should be sent in larger quantities from the ports than from country stations. This had become increasingly the case in the home counties of Surrey, Sussex, and Kent. There were many parts of the country which were mainly residential, consisting mainly of villas with 30 or 40 acres around them farmed for pleasure. There might not be more than three or four farms in the district which were carried on for commercial purposes to each station. It was impossible where there were only three or four farms to each station to make up a sufficient quantity in one consignment in order to get the benefit of the rates which the railways companies allowed where consignments were made up in large bulk. It seemed to him that something should be done in connection with this matter. It was not fair to accuse the farmers of not co-operating, for in many cases it was impossible for a sufficient quantity of produce to be made up to gain the advantage of being conveyed at the minimum rates. He thought that everybody who had to do with the land was tired of these constant accusations of unbusinesslike methods on the part of farmers. A great advance had in recent years been made in the direction of co-operation. He did not think agriculturists had always been well treated by the railway companies. In some cases they had treated them well. In his own constituency there was a society of sixty farmers who supplied milk to the south of London, and they had not been well treated by the London and Brighton and the London and South Western Companies—in fact they had been most unfairly treated. He thought it would be well if the Board of Agriculture had more powers, or rather if they would exercise more freely the powers which they already possessed for bringing pressure to bear on the railway companies, and so imitate the example of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries in Ireland. If the Board of Agriculture in this country did more in the same way as the Irish Board he thought the farmers generally would gain some advantage.

SIR F. BANBURY said the railway companies had no wish to make accusations against the farmers. It was to the interest of the railway companies that large consignments should be sent by the farmers, and they were only too anxious to get traffic. There seemed to be an impression that the railway companies put obstacles in the way of traders. If those who thought so knew more of the inner working of railways they would know that the first object of railway directors and servants was to encourage trade and obtain traffic. The hon. Member for Barnstaple had said that the subject of preferential rates to foreigners had occupied the attention of agriculturalists for many years. It was quite true that there had been vague and unfounded rumours among agricultural people on that subject. When the hon. Member regretted that the Report of the Departmental Committee was not more satisfactory he did not know what was meant by that. A report to be satisfactory must be true upon the facts of the case. He did not suppose that the hon. Gentleman would say that the Committee had not got at the facts of the case. The fact that the Report was in favour of the railway companies was not a proof that it was not satisfactory.

MR. SOARES said that what he stated was that the Members of the Committee mistook the terms of the reference. They said they only had power to deal with questions where certain differences in the rates amounted to undue or illegal preference.

Viscount Turnour.

SIR F. BANBURY said he could only deal with the Report. In regard to the first statement of the hon. Member that this subject had occupied the attention of agriculturalists for many years, he would call attention to paragraph 3 of the Committee's report—

> "The response to the invitation to supply evidence was very meagre. For some time very few replies were received, and the Committee were informed that this was due as regards chambers of agriculture to the fact that the next meetings of the chambers would not be held till October. Except to take the evidence of an inspector of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, the Committee found it necessary to adjourn till October, and as it was then found that scarcely any witnesses were prepared to give evidence, a further adjournment to February of last year became necessary. By that time the Committee had received the names of various witnesses who had been deputed by chambers of agriculture and other associations to give evidence, but most of them still required time for the preparation of their evidence. Some of the witnesses so deputed subsequently wrote that they were unable to give evidence. The general unpreparedness of the witnesses caused the inquiry to make very slow progress, and the Committee found that they could take evidence on only eleven days between February and June."

This showed that there was a sort of indefinite idea in people's heads that they were being treated unfairly, but that when the facts were gone into they had nothing to substantiate it.

*MR. SOARES said a farmer was not in a position to fight a railway company, though he knew that the rates were killing him in some respects. He knew a case where a man bought the product of an orchard, and the railway rates killed him. This man was not in a position to say what the rates ought to have been, and he did not think he gave evidence.

SIR F. BANBURY said the paragraph which he had quoted did not relate to single farmers, though there would have been no difficulty in a farmer, if he wished, giving evidence before the Committee. It was the Chambers of Agriculture which did not come to give evidence. It was surely not contended that the Chambers of Agriculture were not willing to give evidence before the Committee if they had any to give. The hon. Member opposite had said something about the evidence of Mr. Drysdale with regard to the conveyance of fresh meat and frozen meat, but he did not read the answer given by the railway company. The answer showed that it was impossible to carry different classes of meat on the same conditions. The Report said—

> "The witnesses for the Caledonian and North British Railway Companies in reply pointed out that fresh meat and frozen meat were not carried under the same conditions. Fresh meat was hung up in specially constructed vans, and the average loading per van was only 15¾ cwts. in the summer and 27¼ cwts. in the winter. Frozen meat was not hung, but packed so closely as to load upwards of 5 tons 10 cwts. per truck. Frozen meat was conveyed from London to Glasgow, but not from Glasgow to London. The rate of 45s. per ton was put in operation because the shipping companies trading between America and Glasgow wished to try to secure a portion of the frozen meat traffic which came from America direct into the Thames. This object had not been attained. Railway rates operated in both directions, and the result had been that any want of meat in Glasgow was supplied from London. The average of 27¼ cwts. per van for fresh meat worked out at 2·95d. per van per mile compared with 4·10d. per truck per mile for frozen meat assuming a loading of only 3 tons per truck, so that if there was any preference it was largely in favour of the home producer."

While the railway companies were most anxious to give facilities, not only to farmers, but to all traders, they must make a profit; they did not exist for philanthropic purposes, and it was absurd to suppose that a railway company should haul a truck with five tons of frozen meat at the same rate as a van with one ton seven cwts· of fresh meat. The railway companies did not make undue profits. That was shown by the fact that the average return on the enormous amount of money invested in the railways was only 3¼ per cent. The Report of the Departmental Committee at page 6, referring to the Great Northern Railway, stated that—

> "Mr. Dennis alleged that there was a through rate for potatoes from Hamburg *via* Boston Dock to London of 14s. 2d. per ton, out of which the railway company paid the shipping company 6s. per ton, and in addition the dock dues and services performed at the dock might be taken at 1s., thus leaving 7s. 2d. per ton for conveyance to London, as compared with the local rate charged by the railway company of 9s. 2d. per ton.
>
> Mr. Oliver Bury, in reply, said that the rate for potatoes from either Boston dock or station was 9s. 2d. per ton for 4-ton lots or 8s. 4d. for 5-ton lots, that this rate was charged on all potato traffic whether imported or not, that no through rates were quoted by the railway company from Hamburg, that the company could not prevent shipping companies quoting any through rates they pleased as long as the full railway rate was paid, that the shipping company performed the services at the dock, and that the only payment made by the railway company to the dock company out of the rate was 4d. per ton for the use of the dock line and sidings."

He did not wish to say a word against Mr. Dennis; he probably was honest in endeavouring to elucidate the facts, but the evidence showed conclusively that he was mistaken in his idea. There might possibly be some slight preference in a case where a ship came to a dock, and would not unload if the railway rate did not make it worth while to do so. In such a case the ship would go round by sea, and, as the goods came to London all the same, what difference did it make to the farmer? He really felt that it was necessary to put the case of the railway companies before the House. It was quite a mistake to suppose that they were endeavouring to be hard on the people, and especially the English people, who used their lines. He thought that the salary of the private secretary should be the same whether his patron was a Cabinet Minister or not.

*MR. BECK (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech) said that, on behalf of the Cambridgeshire fruit growers, he appealed to the hon. Member for Somersetshire to arrange for periodical reports during the season as to the condition of the fruit crop in Holland, France and Germany. He thought the Board of Agriculture should meet the wishes of the fruit-growers in this matter in the coming year. This was one of the few agricultural industries which was really flourishing and increasing. For instance from Wisbech alone they sent out each year from 14,000 to 15,000 tons of fruit and had despatched as much as 380 tons in one night. He sincerely hoped the hon. Baronet would help these people in the way they desired. In 1905 a Departmental Committee recommended that a bureau should be established to supply information as to fruit culture at home and abroad and as to the condition of foreign crops. He did not see why the Board of Agriculture should not obtain and circulate that information from time to time in regard to not only fruit culture but every other branch of agriculture, including the wool clip and potato crop. It would be a good thing if farmers in this country could obtain reliable information from abroad in regard to all these questions, although he understood that the Board of Agriculture felt the responsibility of attempting to give such information. He wished to point out that the interests of agriculture had been neglected under the last Government, and his constituents felt strongly on the question; and he ventured to press strongly on the hon. Member for South Somerset the necessity of those small practical reforms which were matters of very great importance to them. He also wished the hon. Baronet to look into the case of the outbreak of an epidemic of swine erysipelas in his constituency. The yards were closed and the pigs were killed but the unfortunate owners got no compensation whatever. He understood that the officers of the Agricultural Department exceeded their powers in shutting the yards but kept within them in refusing compensation. The Isle of Ely farmers and owners of small holdings had seized every opportunity of helping themselves in all possible ways and they ought to be encouraged by the Board of Agriculture.

*Mr. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) said he wished to draw attention to the wages paid to the gardeners in Kew Gardens, which, he alleged, were less than those paid to gardeners in the neighbourhood. They all knew that Kew Gardens were a credit to the nation and they all took a delight in visiting them when the flowers were in bloom. He thought that a great many of the men in Kew Gardens who did really skilled work were paid only 21s. a week, while men in the neighbouring district of Richmond who had much less valuable plants to attend to were paid 25s., and the men employed in public parks and gardens under the London County Council received 27s. and 28s. a week. The rate of living at Kew, too, was very high as compared with other places, and he hoped that the Government would recognise that they were bound to give some consideration to the case which he had brought forward. Then, again, there was the case of the constables who, at Kew, worked a seven day week all the year round. It was true that they had got 2s. a week advance, but they never got a Sunday off, and he thought they ought to have that privilege accorded to them at all events occasionally. He also thought that the amount which they were being paid should receive consideration.

Mr. GARDNER (Berkshire, Wokingham) called attention to the report, which was filling agriculturists with terror, that one of the Channel Islands was about to erect abattoirs for the reception of live cattle from Argentina, and proposed to export dead meat, hides, and skins directly to England. He wished to know whether the Board of Agriculture had any authority over proceedings of that kind, and if not, whether they would promote legislation to give them powers of regulation. The protection of our flocks and herds from disease was a most important question for agriculturists, and anything that threatened their safety ought to be obviated at all costs. On the question of railway rates, the Great Western Company, which served his area of country, treated the farmers very fairly indeed, and he could not see why other districts should not be able to obtain equally favourable terms.

*Dr. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey) said that he quite agreed that all cattle admitted into this country ought to be free from foot and mouth disease, but as the exclusion of foreign cattle very closely affected his division he thought he was justified in calling attention to the unemployment in Deptford and Bermondsey caused by the continued exclusion of sheep and cattle from European countries which had been officially declared free from foot and mouth disease. All the sheep skins and hides were now kept abroad, with the result that a very large number of men who would be employed in dealing with them in this country were thrown out of work. Formerly the Deptford Foreign Cattle Market had had brought to it more cattle and sheep than any other market, upwards of 750,000 sheep used to be killed at Deptford every year, and over

100,000 cattle. More than 80 per cent. of these hides and skins came to Bermondsey and found work for a large number of tanners and fellmongers. When this prohibition took effect a large number of these men were thrown out of employment. The cattle yard belonged to the city corporation and it was a very fit and proper place for the slaughtering of cattle. All the meat was inspected after slaughtering and the Londoner enjoyed the great advantage under that system of being able to purchase freshly killed meat which had been properly inspected. Part of their grievance was that nearly all of the hides from the American cattle were by agreement with the American cattle owners salted down and returned to America and did not benefit the English tanner. Of course they had no objection to the importation of cattle from the United States, if it was free from foot and mouth disease, and they recognised that cattle from countries in which there was foot and mouth disease should not be allowed to enter. When, however, countries like Holland and Denmark and the whole of the German Rhine provinces were officially declared by their Governments to be free from foot and mouth disease, it was singular that preference should be given to cattle from the United States. He believed that no case of foot and mouth disease in England had ever been traced to cattle brought from Denmark or Holland. These countries were in this matter quite as careful as England, and inspected all cattle and sheep before shipment. The prohibition was an unnatural and artificial restriction of trade to the advantage of the American cattle exporter, the English farmer, and ultimately to the English landowner. At the present time the cattle shipped came from the United States and Canada, but the greater portion came from the United States. When there was an out-break of foot and mouth disease in five of the New England States two or three years ago the Government, instead of prohibiting importation from the whole of the United States as they had done in Europe, allowed it to go on as long as the United States Government drew a cordon round the infected States. Immediately the United States declared those five States to be free from disease, importation from them was allowed and we were having cattle from those States, although importation was not allowed from Denmark and Holland, which had been for eighteen months absolutely free from foot and mouth disease. He pointed out that owing to the restrictions against Denmark and Holland and other countries, the Americans were in the habit of holding back their cattle to keep up the price of meat in the market. By its action the Board of Agriculture gave an opportunity to the Americans to rig the meat market. The daily papers gave ample evidence of this. On one day last week they kept back 1,300 simply because the price was not favourable. If importation was allowed from Holland and Denmark, the Americans would not be able to hold their cattle back, and the Londoner would immediately benefit in having cheaper meat. He thought that the Board of Agriculture was following the wrong line because the Department was protecting the farmer and the land owner at the expense of the working man.

*MR. GEORGE FABER (York) expressed surprise that any hon. Member should advocate the free importation of cattle or sheep from abroad. Foot and mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia were much too serious to the agricultural interest of the country to be played with. He appealed with all the energy his language could command to the representative of the Board of Agriculture to take no steps to relax the present precautions. Any such relaxation would be unfair to the greatest standing industry that the country possessed. He could not speak with any confidence of the action of the President of the Board of Agriculture, for he could not forget that during the recent debate on the subject of the importation of Canadian cattle, the hon. Baronet who represented the Board sat in the House all day, but never gave the slightest indication of what the opinion of that Department was on a matter which vexed the country from one end to the other. He hoped that the hon. Gentleman and the Department he represented would take their courage in both hands and forget for the moment that they represented a Party, and try to remember that they represented the State. With regard to the subject of railway rates, the difference had been pointed out between the low rates for goods conveyed from the ports to London and those coming from inland towns. But obviously the reason why the rate from the port was low was that the sea rate and the railway rate together enabled the freighter to quote a low through rate. If the rates were unfair, there were the Railway Commissioners to be appealed to, a body established for the purpose. He agreed with the hon. Member for Barnstaple that it was a matter of expense to go to them, but if the Government were to adopt the hon. Member's suggestion and the Board of Agriculture were to pay the expenses of every farmer who was unfairly rated in taking his case before the Railway Commissioners, it would amount to a very serious sum in the course of a year. Agriculture, as they all knew, was in a submerged condition. Why? Because agriculture could not live in this country against the present competition with foreigners. That was the bed-rock of the whole matter. Let the Minister for Agriculture do whatever he liked, everything would be a mere palliative. At the root of the whole matter were the conditions on the other side of the Atlantic and in various parts of the world where there was virgin land on which men were able to produce corn and meat at a much lower price than we could hope to do here. As to the gardeners at Kew he heartily supported every word which had been said about them. He took a great delight in those gardens, and he thought those employed in them should be paid a proper wage.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.), in reply to the various questions asked during the discussion said that he forbore to go into the question of the importation of Canadian cattle, believing that the action of the Government had given general satisfaction. In reference to the disease of glanders, the position had been explained by the President of the Board in reply to a deputation. It was a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence, but the Board of Agriculture were quite in sympathy with proposals to stamp out this terrible disease. The Treasury, however, regretted that they were unable to provide the necessary funds in the current year. He hoped, however, that when the Treasury was in a position to give assistance that, with the continued co-operation of the London County Council, more effectual means would be taken to stamp out this disease. He was glad to be able to state that the action of the Board had decreased by more than one-half the outbreaks of the disease of sheep-scab. Very satisfactory results had ensued owing to the action that had been taken by the Board in this matter, although he confessed that the stringent regulations had given rise to a certain amount of irritation in individual cases. The necessity of those regulations for the eradication of the disease was, however, generally recognised at present and they were being carried out with little or no friction. As to further inquiry into the origin and remedy for other diseases of live stock, the Board of Agriculture were most anxious where possible, and where they could get assistance from the Treasury, to make inquiry into the best method of stamping out any disease which affected our flocks and herds. A Departmental Committee had been appointed to inquire into the subject of Epizootic Abortion, and was conducting a most important inquiry. It would be premature to make any statement as to their labours, but the appointment of that Committee had already been amply justified by the results of its investigations up to the present moment. Then the Departmental Committee upon Railway Rates which was appointed a short time ago by Lord Onslow had been referred to. Complaint had been made, and not unjustly, of the Report of that Committee. The hon. Member for the Horsham division of Sussex complained of the Majority Report, and indeed it was only defended by the junior Member for the City of London. For himself, as with other Members, his own feeling was that the Minority Report was much the more valuable, but the suggestions in both Reports would be carefully considered by the Board of Agriculture.

It was certainly the desire of the Board to be in close communication with farmers throughout the country, and farmers might with confidence feel that they had a friend in the Board, anxious to assist them, and knowing how difficult it was for the agricultural interest to fight the powerful combination of railway companies. He reminded hon. Members that the Board had not the same power as to railway rates in this country as could be exercised in Ireland. The hon. Member for the Wisbech Division had referred to the question of fruit-growing, and had asked for the issue of statistics on the question of fruit-crops at home and abroad. The hon. Member also said that his constituents would like to know how long they should hold their wool-clip and to have other general advice. As a farmer himself he would always be glad to have advice as to his business, but it was not possible for the Government to give advice on such speculative matters. They could give information from time to time from statistics which they had been able to prepare, but such information had to be founded on the most reliable information. The length of time which a man ought to hold his wool-clip was not such information as a Government ought to give. His hon. friend had also expressed the hope that the present Government would not neglect the agricultural interest in the way the late Government had. Without going into such a controversial matter he might be permitted to say that he knew to what his hon. friend referred, and he could assure him that the present Government had no intention of following the example of the late Government and they had shown that they were not unmindful of the interests of agriculture. With regard to the wages paid to labourers at Kew, referred to by the hon. Member for Sunderland, the Board would be quite ready to inquire into any allegation that the payment was below the current rate in the neighbourhood. But the wages of the labourers had been increased only two months ago from 21s. to 23s. a week. Reference had been made to the threatened invasion of the Channel Islands for the purpose of setting up a great cattle wharf in Alderney to which cattle could be brought from the Argentine and other countries to be slaughtered. So far as he understood the matter it was simply a Stock Exchange scheme. A syndicate appeared to think it would be a profitable thing to have such a wharf in that island for the slaughter of cattle. All he could say now was that the Board of Agriculture were fully alive to the matter, and were carefully watching it. It was very undesirable to go into the question of what powers the Board of Agriculture had to deal with a matter of this kind, but the hon. Member might rest perfectly assured that the resources of the Board of Agriculture were quite sufficient to deal with it if the proposal threatened to become a standing danger not only to this country but to the important industry of cattle breeding in the Channel Islands. The hon. Member was no doubt aware of the fact that there was a great industry in cattle breeding in these islands and that for over 150 years no cattle had been allowed to be landed in the Channel Islands in order that the purity of the breeds there might be maintained. Such importation as had been suggested might have the effect, if not of destroying, at least of endangering to a very great extent this important business of cattle breeding. He could assure the hon. Member that all the facts were well-known to the Board of Agriculture, who might be relied upon to look after the interests both of this country and of the Channel Islands. He hoped the people of the Channel Islands would take steps to safeguard themselves and would not do anything to facilitate the entry of foreign cattle into Alderney. With regard to the observations of the hon. Member for Southwark, he could only say that it would be highly improper for the Board of Agriculture to relax the regulations against the importation of European cattle and sheep merely because Holland and Denmark had been free from foot and mouth disease for one year. Foot and mouth disease existed in other parts of the Continent. It was one of these insidious diseases which, after lying dormant for awhile, broke out suddenly and spread with great rapidity. Therefore they could not take any particular country on the Continent and say that foot and mouth disease did not exist there, and that, therefore, the cattle of that country might be admitted here. They must take the Continent as a whole. It was a very infectious disease, and it did not respect scientific frontiers, and could be carried very readily from one place to another on the clothing or the boots of a person. The last case that appeared in London was at the Metropolitan market, and within thirty-six hours the disease appeared in the Edinburgh market, evidently carried there by a person who had attended the London market and then gone back to Scotland. The restrictions must be maintained, and he could not hold out any hope of relaxation unless the condition of things on the Continent altered very much. It would not be right to relax those regulations having regard to the enormous loss our farmers and ratepayers had suffered in the past owing to outbreaks of foot and mouth disease.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) said he had been requested by the Holderness Agricultural Club to bring forward one case of swine fever. In most cases when an outbreak of swine fever occurred an inspector of the Board of Agriculture presented himself and ordered the pigs to be slaughtered. The case of this one farmer was different. At the commencement of May last a Mr. Doubleday was the proud possessor of a collection of 124 pigs; at the present moment he possessed something less than twenty. This was due to an outbreak of swine fever, which occurred on May 15. The farmer reported the outbreak to an inspector of the Board of Agriculture, and the inspector refused to slaughter the pigs. The inspector was of opinion that swine fever was put about by the carelessness of farmers in importing tainted animals into their stocks, but this was not the case here because this man had not imported any pigs on to his farm since September, 1905. Two of his neighbours had had outbreaks of swine fever and in those cases the inspector had entered and ordered the slaughter of the pigs. He understood in the case of slaughter the compensation paid was half the value when the pigs were diseased, and the whole value in the case of sound pigs. He failed to understand the action of the Inspector in this case, and could not see why one man should be treated differently from another. The best way of stamping out the disease, which had been very prevalent in the East Riding, was by slaughter.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford) did not think the hon. Baronet had quite grasped the view of the Member for the Wisbech Division of Cambridge with regard to the question of the culture of fruit. What the hon. Member really desired to know was whether something more could not be done to give effect to the recommendations of the Departmental Committee which considered this question and reported on it last year. One or two of the recommendations were very important indeed. One of them was that someone should be appointed by the Board of Agriculture to act as the kindly adviser between the consignors and the railway companies. Another was that there should be an extension of the Market Gardeners' Act, which could be done by making Section 4 retrospective. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman for the answers he had already given, and was glad to hear that the wages of the Kew gardeners had been increased.

*SIR EDWARD STRACHEY promised to look into the question put to him by the hon. Member for Holderness on the question of swine fever, and with regard to what the hon. Member for Dartford had said, he would only say that the recommendations of the Fruit Committee were receiving careful attention. Some of them required legislation and others required money, but his noble friend had quite recently received a deputation on the subject and had expressed the desire of the Board to do all they could on behalf of the fruit industry.

*MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) congratulated the Government upon the opportunity they had given to the Committee to discuss the Vote for the Board of Agriculture. The hon. Baronet had referred to the Report of the Committee on Preferential Rates and had given the Committee the startling information that he was going to be guided by the Minority

Report of the Committee, which was signed by one member, instead of by the Majority Report which had been signed by six members. He hoped the hon. Baronet had good ground for the rather startling attitude he had taken up on the matter. But other topics had interested the agricultural community of this country for many years more than those that had been mentioned, and none interested them more greatly than the question of the reform of local taxation; and, therefore, he would be glad if the hon. Baronet could give some information to the Committee as to when the Government were going to take this matter up. Another matter which should be forced on the attention of the Board of Agriculture was the butter question. There had been a Committee sitting to inquire into the circumstances attending the sale of butter in this country, and he would like to ask the hon. Baronet whether it was the intention of the Government to introduce legislation with regard to the sale and production of butter so that it might be safeguarded from adulteration.

*MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) pointed out that the hon. Baronet in the course of his reply had stated that a good deal depended upon proper help being forthcoming from the Treasury. In this regard he asked the Committee to compare the amount given by the Treasury to the English Department of Agriculture with that given to the Irish Board of Agriculture. He did not take exception to Ireland receiving the large sum she did, but he thought it would be only reasonable if under the circumstances the English Department was better treated. Members from rural constituencies knew perfectly well that certain sums were placed at the disposal of the county councils out of what were called the "whiskey moneys" for technical education, but when it came to the matter of experiments and utilising these moneys for experiments in agriculture the county councils were confronted with restrictions of the Local Government Board auditors.

THE CHAIRMAN said the Question did not arise on this Vote.

*MR. BARNARD said he would not go into the matter further; he only desired to suggest to the hon. Baronet that the English Board of Agriculture was not treated in at all a generous way, and he hoped he would bring this matter to the attention of his colleagues in the Government and if possible effect a change for the better.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said he wondered if it had ever occurred to the Government that if there was no compensation there would be very little or no swine-fever. People had only to feed pigs on maize, give them little water, let them lie dirty, and there would be as much swine-fever as the Government cared to pay for. He could not help thinking that the Government would do a great deal better by paying no compensation.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said that under the provisions of the Scab Act the Board of Agriculture had power to dispense with its operation under certain circumstances. In one of the islands in his constituency there were only sixteen sheep which were moved from the island only once in six or seven years, and it was an abominable hardship that they should have to dip those sheep twice a year. It took seventeen or twenty men to catch them when they had to be dipped. In another case it was even worse. There was a larger and more populous island. There were 300 or 400 people on it and there were about as many sheep. Those sheep never left the island and during a portion of the year they lived entirely on seaweed. Sheep disease of any sort had never been known on the island, and yet they were afflicted with this abominable hardship. They had sent a petition to the hon. Baronet which had not, he thought, received the sympathetic consideration it deserved, and he trusted the hon. Gentleman would take this matter now into his earnest consideration.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) called attention to the damage done to crops by motor cars. The dust raised by motor cars, he said, possessed some particularly irritating quality which injured the stock which grazed on a crop which had been smothered by it, and subsequently wetted by the dew.

THE CHAIRMAN: How can the Board of Agriculture deal with this question?

*MR. REES: I do not know, Sir, and if the Board of Agriculture cannot, I will try the Local Government Board.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) asked the hon. Baronet to be very careful how he abrogated any of the regulations with regard to the sheep scab. Everyone recognised that the Board of Agriculture had always done its best to initiate legislation when required. There were, he thought, one or two things that were now pressing in that regard. One in particular was a Bill dealing with fertilisers and feeding-stuffs and their adulteration. He hoped that the hon. Baronet would enforce the recommendations of the Committee in that matter.

*MR. CAIRNS (Newcastle-on-Tyne) said that the term preferential rates was used as implying that they were given on equal quantities of commodities. Many loose statements had been made and in fairness the matter should be cleared up. In one case between two points the rate was stated as per 2-ton lots, but in the other case the rate from the shipping port was given only for train loads and very large quantities. He held no brief whatever for the railway companies; he would rather join with agricultural Members in getting all possible railway facilities, but they ought to have the actual situation placed fairly before the country. It had been stated that the present embargo upon live animals coming from abroad was not protective. If anyone wanted evidence as to its protective character, he had only to look at the case of Iceland sheep. There had never been a case of disease from Iceland, but Iceland sheep were kept out of this country. They had been of great advantage indeed to many northern farmers to put on the moors and less fertile land, and they realised a very handsome profit. They were no longer available, and in that way much injury had been done to the agricultural industry. He did not accept the statement that the agricultural industry was satisfied at the exclusion of foreign cattle. Many agriculturists throughout the country felt it a very great hardship that they could not have the liberty to carry on their trade under safe conditions, as they would have under the free importation of cattle. The result of the exclusion had been that dead meat had been brought into the country—tinned, preserved, and chilled—and while disease had been kept out in the live animals, it had come in in the form of dead meat. In straining at the gnat they had swallowed the camel. The Board of Agriculture should seek to have the power restored to them of deciding whether live cattle should be admitted or excluded as the circumstances required.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

SUPPLY [24TH MAY] [REPORT].

Resolutions reported:

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1906-7.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,053,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of Victualling and Clothing for the Navy, including the cost of Victualling Establishments at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £275,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Medical Services, including the cost of Medical Establishments at Home and Abroad, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £14,700, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Martial Law, including the cost of Naval Prisons at Home and Abroad, which will come in

course of payment during the year ending on 31st day of March, 1907."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £165,600, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Educational Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

5. "That a sum, not exceeding £65,100, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Scientific Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £426,600, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of the Royal Naval Reserve, the Royal Fleet Reserve (including Seamen Pensioner Reserve), and the Royal Naval Volunteers, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £482,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of various Miscellaneous Effective Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

CIVIL SERVICES.

CLASS VI.

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £358,969, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities under sundry Statutes, for Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities awarded by the Treasury, and for the Salaries of Medical Referees."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £122,644, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for making good Deficiencies on the Income Accounts of the Funds for Trustee Savings Banks, Friendly Societies and Post Office Savings Banks."

Resolutions agreed to.

SUPPLY [21ST JUNE]. [REPORT.]

Resolution reported:

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1906-7.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

"That a sum, not exceeding £10,496,741, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs.

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [28TH JUNE]. [REPORT.]

Resolution reported:

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES 1906-7.

CLASS II.

"That a sum, not exceeding £110,146, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of Agriculture and other Industries and Technical Instruction for Ireland, and of the services administered by that Department, including sundry Grants in Aid."

Resolution agreed to.

SUPPLY [7TH JUNE]. [REPORT.]

Resolutions reported:

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1906-7.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,111,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Quarterings, Transport, and Remounts, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £4,492,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Supplies and Clothing, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £775,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Ordnance Department Establishments and the Supply and Repair of General Stores, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

4. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,543,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Supply and Repair of Armaments and Engineer Stores, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

5. "That a sum not exceeding £2,353,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Barrack Construction; for Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad (including Purchase of Land), and for the Staff in connection therewith, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

6. "That a sum, not exceeding £132,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for certain Establishments for Military Education, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

7. "That a sum, not exceeding £77,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Sundry Miscellaneous Effective Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

8. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,694,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Rewards, Half-Pay, Retired Pay, Widows' Pensions, Wounds Pensions, and other Non-Effective Charges for Officers, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

9. "That a sum, not exceeding £1,684,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, and the In-Pensioners thereof; for Out-Pensions and for Gratuities awarded in Commutation and in lieu of Pensions; for the Maintenance of Lunatics for whom Pensions are not drawn; for Pensions to Schoolmistresses and Nurses; for Rewards for Meritorious Services; for Victoria Cross Pensions; and for Pensions, etc., to the Widows and Children of Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, and Men, etc., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

10. "That a sum, not exceeding £180,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Civil Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities, also for Payments under the Workmen's Compensation Act, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907."

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES 1906-7.

CLASS III.

11. "That a sum, not exceeding £26,953, be granted to His Majesty to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1907, for the Salaries of the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners of the Metropolitan Police, and of the Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District, the Pay and Expenses of Offices of Metropolitan Police employed on special duties, and the Salaries and Expenses of the Inspectors of Constabulary."

Resolutions agreed to.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Order of the House this day.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 16th July, 1906.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Sutton District Water.

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10).

And also the Certificate that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have not been complied with:—South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

London Squares and Enclosures Bill [H.L.]. The Marquess Camden consented to the Bill.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill—(Barton-upon-Irwell Order). A petition of Messrs. Baker and Company of 54, Parliament Street, Westminster, Parliamentary Agents, praying for leave to present a petition of the Barton-upon-Irwell Rural District Council, praying to be heard by council against the Order, although the time limited by Standing Order No. 93 for presenting such petition has expired; read, and ordered to lie on the Table, and Standing Order No. 93 to be considered To-morrow in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said petition.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill. Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Thursday next.

Derby Gas Bill. Reported, with Amendments.

Buckhaven, Methil, and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill [H.L.]. Reported with Amendments.

Water Provisional Order Bill. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill; The orders of the 29th of June and Thursday last discharged. Ordered that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

Great Northern Railway Bill. The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The orders made on Tuesday and Thursday last discharged, and Bill committed for To-morrow.

South Lincolnshire Water Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2^a; agreed to: Bill read 2^a accordingly, and committed.

London Squares and Enclosures Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^a, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

London United Tramways Bill. Watford Gas Bill. Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill. Read 3^a, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Devon, etc.) Bill [H.L.]. Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Kesteven, etc.) Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Newport Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments.

Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Cheltenham Gas Bill. Huddersfield Corporation Bill. London and South Western Railway Bill. London County Buildings Bill. Metropolitan Water

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Board Bill. North East London Railway Bill. Peterborough Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill. Moved, That the order made on the 26th day of March last, "That no Provisional Order Confirmation Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after the 19th day of June next," be dispensed with, and that the Bill be now read 2ª; agreed to: Bill read 2ª accordingly.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL.

Order of the day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That this Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Earl of Onslow.*)

On Question, Bill read 3ª.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, the object of my Amendment is to reinstate in the Bill the clauses which were struck out by your Lordships' Committee, giving powers to the London County Council to establish an ambulance service. These powers were unanimously granted in the House of Commons, and when the matter was before the London County Council there was almost unanimity with regard to the suggestion; at all events, the scheme as put forward by the London County Council, and as it came before the Committee of the House of Lords, was not divided against. Your Lordships' Committee, of course, is as much entitled to its opinion as the Committee of the House of Commons, but I would venture to suggest that where you have something like unanimity in the London County Council with regard to a particular measure and where you have a Committee of the House of Commons unanimously approving of the proposal, there ought to be rather strong reasons given for your Lordships differing both from the London County Council and from the House of Commons.

I confess that from one point of view I rise with some reluctance to propose this Amendment. I do not wish in any way to damp the ardour for economy that has been shown by the noble Earl opposite, and by other noble Lords on that side of the House lately when discussing the London County Council Money Bill. I am exceedingly glad that that Bill should have been discussed in your Lordships' House, and I am delighted to find that many noble Lords on the opposite side are now advocates of economy and sound finance. I have no doubt that this championship of economy on Lord Camperdown's part will be as permanent as it is sincere, and that when the time comes for his own Party to be in office he will make suggestions to them and criticise their proceedings in the same impartial spirit. With regard to this suggested ambulance service, I have had some difficulty, after reading with great care the evidence placed before your Lordships' Committee, in understanding the reason why the Committee disapproved of the proposal, and that is partly the reason why I have put down this Amendment. I wish to give the noble Earl an opportunity of stating the views he holds on the matter. I cannot quite make out whether the noble Earl objects to this expenditure because it is too small or because it is too large. I imagine that the position of the noble Earl is this, that the London County Council ought to have taken one of two courses. It ought either to have gone in for a complete system, or it ought not to have asked for any powers for an ambulance service at all.

I quite admit that there is something to be said for the London County Council providing London with a complete ambulance service, but you must recollect that the circumstances of London are somewhat peculiar. We have in London various voluntary bodies which to a certain extent do provide ambulance facilities, and we felt that if we rushed in and covered the whole field, probably those voluntary systems, if they did not cease to exist altogether, might dwindle, and then the ratepayers would be saddled with the whole cost of the ambulance service. Our proposal is to spend only £5,200 for the first year on the ambulance service. It was suggested in the Committee, and it has been suggested on the London County Council that we ought to be in a position to know exactly how much it is proposed ultimately to spend on this system. As to that it is almost impossible to give a trustworthy estimate, but we have done our best. The noble Earl had has a witness before his Committee, Sir Shirley Murphy, our principal Officer of Health. Sir Shirley Murphy gave a detailed statement with regard to the possible cost of an efficient ambulance service of twenty-one stations in London, in the event of the total failure of the voluntary help which London now receives.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: The noble Lord will remember that that was, as Sir Shirley Murphy admitted, a rough estimate of his own. It had never been tested in any way.

LORD MONKSWELL: I know it was a rough estimate, but Sir Shirley Murphy, who is the principal officer in this matter, prepared the estimate to the best of his ability after going carefully into the matter, and I do not suppose that if we had another estimate it would differ very much. I would venture to suggest that in this matter the question of the co-ordination of our expenditure hardly arises. In the first place, the expenditure is by no means big. We ask only for £5,200 for the first year, with a possible increase to £30,000. This possible increase to £30,000 is the outside estimate, for it is certain that the City will have its own ambulance service, and we have offers of motor ambulances from voluntary associations. Surely, in a question of this kind it is very difficult to wait until we have co-ordinated all our expenditure.

We have done our best for three or four years to suggest to other people that they should supply London with an an efficient ambulance service. They have never done so, and the result is that the ambulance service in London is now certainly very inefficient. As to that I think there can be absolutely no doubt in the minds of those of your Lordships at all events who were members of the Committee, and noble Lords who know the circumstances will admit that our witness, Sir William Collins, did not exaggerate Sir William Collins was asked by Mr. Lushington to tell their Lordships what these voluntary associations were, and he replied—

"There is the St. John's Ambulance Association, the British, the Bischoffsheim Ambulance Service or the Hospitals' Association, the Volunteer Medical Staff Corps, and the Police. Certain boards of guardians, certain hospitals, and one or two railway companies have ambulances of their own, and there are one or two trading companies that supply ambulances. I can state to their Lordships, if they desire, what the various voluntary associations do. The St. John's Ambulance Association deals with the training of men in the work of first aid and ambulance work; they have some twenty-five ambulance stations in London, with litters and stretchers, and other ambulance appliances, but with three exceptions there are no men on duty at those stations. The three exceptions are, at St. John's Gate, St. Paul's Cathedral, and St. Clement Danes; but I believe there are not men on duty constantly throughout the night at those stations. Then there is the Bischoffsheim Service, which is a branch of the Hospitals' Association, and was established in 1890 by Mr. H. L. Bischoffsheim, which service consists in placing hand ambulances and stores at various fire brigade stations and cab ranks, which are available for use by the police, who have a key to the station; but no one is on duty there to work the ambulance. The Volunteer Medical Staff Corps is primarily a military organisation, which on special occasions like public processions attends to casualties and accidents which occur in the streets. The County Council on several occasions of public processions has worked in association with them, in providing temporary shelters and accommodation. Then the police possess hand ambulances and wheeled litters; but they have no horse ambulances in constant readiness; the only horsed ambulances are at Rochester Row Police Station, Carter Street and Stoke Newington, and those apparently are not kept in readiness, and the arrangement for hiring have to be made by the individual who desires the use of the ambulance. They were originally private property, but they have been taken in hand by the police."

The Metropolitan Asylums Board has been approached with a view of supplying the want. The Metropolitan Asylums Board deals principally with infectious diseases, and I should have thought it extremely desirable that ambulances for infectious diseases should be under absolutely different management from other ambulances, or, at all events, that the same staff should not deal with one as deals with the other. The Metropolitan Asylums Board sent to the County Council a communication on February 27th, 1904. They were then contemplating extending their ambulance service, which had hitherto been chiefly confined to the removal of cases of infectious disease. But their extension was not to include dealing with street accidents or casualties, and they proposed to make a charge of 7s. 6d. in respect of each removal. Therefore what they had in view was not to meet the general case

Then my noble friend Viscount Knutsford was approached. He is connected with the St. John's Ambulance Association, and he expressed his desire that we should proceed and improve the ambulance service of London. Sir Kenneth Barrington, who was then actively connected with it, expressed similar views, and Mr. Bischoffscheim, of the Hospitals Association, has always been favourable to our proposals and has himself offered to provide motor ambulances if the Council is entrusted with the power of mantaining them. Such is the position with regard to the ambulance service in London.

Now, let us see how far that service is efficient. Sir William Collins went very carefully into that. He said that in four weeks he had evidence of some 1,949 cases in the chief London hospitals, and that deducting those which arrived on their own legs and taking only those that came in some kind of conveyance or other, there were 947 more or less serious casualty cases and cases of illness, and only 289, or about 31 per cent., were brought to the nine hospitals in any kind of ambulance, while more than two-thirds arrived in hansoms, four-wheelers, vans, or other unsuitable means of conveyance. Then, again, he made further investigation at the London Temperance Hospital from August, 1901, to January, 1902. He found that out of 203 cases conveyed to the hospital otherwise than on their own legs, 48 were brought in four-wheeled cabs, 102 in hansoms, 22 in vans or carts, 3 in bath-chairs, one in a barrow, 19 in ambulances, and 8 on hand-stretchers; so that 150 cases out of 203 arrived in cabs. And he added—

> "I have known many cases of unnecessary pain and danger and injury result from putting atients with injured limbs or with undetermined internal injuries into four-wheelers or hansom cabs."

Sir William Collins also stated that communications had been received from Hammersmith, Fulham, Battersea, Poplar, Wandsworth, Greenwich, Bethnal Green, Finsbury, Woolwich, Lambeth, Hackney, and Kensington urging the council to consider the desirability of establishing an ambulance service for London; and that the Council had also received deputations from medical men, including the president of the College of Physicians, the president of the College of Surgeons, and many other medical men, who urged it to proceed on the lines on which the Council was now asking Parliament to give it power. It cannot, in these circumstances, be urged that it is not necessary to improve the ambulance service in London.

Let me ask your Lordships to consider what has been done by other municipalities in providing ambulances. Sir William Collins was asked by Mr. Lushington to give the various large towns where there was a service now in the hands of the municipal authorities, and he replied—

> "There are rapid ambulance services at Liverpool, Birkenhead, Manchester, Oldham, Bradford, Newcastle, Huddersfield, Bolton, Blackburn, Bristol, Gateshead, Burnley, Hull, Sheffield, Leeds, and Wolverhampton, worked in association with the fire brigades in some cases, but in all cases, I believe, under municipal control."

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: Those are all police authorities.

Lord MONKSWELL: That is perfectly true, but I do not quite see what that has to do with London's not having an efficient ambulance service. Is London to wait until the police are under the control of the County Council before it has an efficient ambulance service? I am of opinion that the police should be under the County Council, but I do not think we should wait until then before we have our ambulance service put into an efficient condition. Moreover, we do not think that the police are the proper body to have control of this service.

The Committee over which my noble friend Lord Camperdown presided has succeeded in pleasing nobody, but in displeasing everybody by the decision at which it has arrived. The City only opposed our scheme on the ground of rating. They did not object to our establishing a service in London so long as they were not rated. I believe we can come to a satisfactory arrangement with the City with regard to expense. I do not think that blocks the way at all. The proposal, I believe, is that in so far as the City ambulance service is satisfactory the City should be given a certain grant. At all events, I understand that the City is perhaps as much distressed as any one that these clauses have been struck out. I have merely to say, in conclusion, that, although I know that your Lordships are not very ready to interfere with the decisions of your Committees, it did appear to me that this was a matter of so much public importance that it was my duty to obtain a statement from the noble Earl as to the reasons why his Committee came to the decision to strike out these Clauses.

Amendment moved.

"In the preamble, page 3, line 36, after the word 'made' to insert 'and whereas it is expedient that the council should be empowered to establish and maintain, or to contribute toward or otherwise aid in the establishment and maintenance of an ambulance service for dealing with cases of accident and illness in the streets and other public places in the county.'"

"In Clause 2, page 6, line 13, after the word 'Drainage' to insert 'Part IV.—Ambulance Service.'; in page 6, line 14, to leave out 'IV.' and to insert 'V.'; in line 15, to leave out 'V.' and to insert 'VI.'; in line 17, to leave out 'VI.' and to insert 'VII.'; and in page 19, line 5, after the word 'works' to insert 'Part IV.—Ambulance Service.' 24. It shall be lawful for the council to establish and maintain, or to contribute towards the cost of or otherwise aid in establishing and maintaining an ambulance service for dealing with cases of accident and illness in the streets or other public places in the county. 25.—(1) The council may for the purposes of this part of this Act, and as and when they may think requisite for carrying such purposes into effect: (*a*) Appropriate, hold, and use any lands or buildings for the time being vested in them for any purpose for which such lands or buildings are not required; (*b*) take on lease, purchase by agreement, or otherwise acquire any lands or buildings within the county; (*c*) erect, or cause to be erected, and maintain, repair, and manage on any lands so appropriated or acquired any buildings suitable for the said purposes; (*d*) adapt, furnish, and equip any buildings so appropriated, acquired, or erected. (2) The council may from time to time sell, lease, or let any lands or buildings acquired by or vested in them for the purposes of this part of this Act, and not required for such purposes. (3) The council may for the purposes of this part of this Act contract with any company or persons for the establishment and maintenance of telegraphic, telephonic, or other suitable means of communication between the several buildings used for the purposes of this part of this Act, and between any of such buildings and other parts of the county. 26.—(1) For the purposes of this part of this Act the council may employ and pay such officers and servants as they may think expedient for the efficient conduct of the service authorised by this part of this Act. (2) The council may from time to time provide and maintain such ambulances and other vehicles to be drawn by hand, or by animal or electrical or other mechanical power, as they may think requisite for the accommodation and conveyance of persons meeting with accidents or seized with illness in the streets or public places in the county. Provided that any electrical power used for moving any such vehicle shall be entirely contained in and carried along with such vehicle in such a manner that no magnetic or other influence is created which is likely to affect injuriously any telegraphic line of the Postmaster-General.—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

*LORD LEIGH: My Lords, it is greatly to be hoped that your Lordships will accept the Amendment which has just been moved by the noble Lord opposite. It is recognised that a rapid ambulance service, motor or horse, is wanted for London, in place of the hand-litters and four-wheeled cabs which at present constitute the only service by which wounded persons are conveyed to the hospitals or to their homes. That conveyance in four-wheeled cabs not only causes intense agony, but very frequently also turns an ordinary fracture into a compound fracture, is the opinion of many medical authorities, among others of Sir William Church, and it may be mentioned that many of the most eminent medical practitioners in London have lately formed themselves into an association under the name of the Metropolitan Street Ambulance Association, their object being to revise the ambulance service of London on the lines adopted by the County Council.

No other city at all approaching London in size is now without a rapid ambulance service. The system originated in New York, and rapidly spread to Boston and Washington and all the principal cities of the United States, and then it was adopted by Paris, Berlin, and by Vienna, and, as the noble Lord has informed us, it has been copied in very many provincial towns and cities in Great Britain. One point about the ambulance service to be noted is that in London at three police stations only are there any horsed ambulances available, and they can only be obtained on payment. When once payment is demanded, and the wounded person has to wait until the money is found for his removal, the system falls to the ground. It is also to be noted that the London County Council only adopted the idea of rapid ambulances after it had been rejected by all the other public bodies in London. It was not only refused by the hospitals; it was refused also by the police, by the Metropolitan Asylums Board, and by the

Fire Brigade, and then at length the London County Council adopted the idea. As regards the City, as my noble friend mentioned, the City has a system of its own in contemplation, and there is no reason whatever why the London County Council should not work harmoniously with the City. It is greatly to be hoped that the Amendment of my noble friend will meet with the approval of your Lordships' House.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, as I was Chairman of the Committee which rejected this proposal put forward by the London County Council, your Lordships will no doubt expect me to say a few words in explanation of the course which we pursued. But before I do so I must take exception to a remark made by Lord Monkswell at the close of his speech to the effect that the City Corporation were displeased at this scheme's being rejected. I do not know what authority the noble Lord has for making that statement. I can only say that their representative spoke to me as I was coming into the House in quite a contrary sense. The noble Lord seems to forget that the City Corporation appeared in opposition to the scheme, and that if the scheme had not been rejected their opposition would have had to be heard and was directed to the principle of the Bill. They said that they themselves had a scheme, not merely in contemplation but in a more advanced stage than this proposed scheme of the London County Council, and they objected. They stated that they had already 1,400 police who would administer a scheme of ambulances in the City, and they objected to being rated also as part of the County of London for this purpose.

The noble Lord omitted to state one thing which is very relevant indeed, and that is that the Home Office is opposed to the scheme. A report by the Home Office, dated March 6th, was laid before our Committee objecting to this scheme. It is an official report, and the Home Office states that it is a question whether additional facilities required would not be more efficiently and economically provided by the development of the existing services. The Home Office goes on to say that ambulance litters on wheels are provided at every police station, and that the Secretary of State is informed that no difficulty is experienced by the police—and remember the police are the persons who come first into contact with accidents—in dealing promptly with cases of accident or illness in the streets. It would in any case, the Secretary of State thinks, be undesirable to have two public services covering almost exactly the same ground each acting independently of the other. The Secretary of State pointed out in this connection that the police were obviously in the best position for dealing with such cases, as they were on the spot and could attend to them without delay, and that the police service could be extended without much difficulty and expense by the provision of additional ambulances. Therefore the Home Office is opposed to the scheme, and I understand that the Home Office is on the point of communicating with the County Council and suggesting a conference with them on this matter.

Now, my Lords, let us come to this Bill, because it is the Bill that we are dealing with and not the general question of ambulances. Everybody desires to have a good ambulance service, but the question is, by whom is it to be provided, and whether or not the proposed scheme is a good one. That is what came before the Committee. Let me tell your Lordships, in a few words, what has happened in Parliament in regard to this matter. Last session the London County Council made up their minds that they would proceed with a Bill, and their General Purposes Committee put forward a proposal to have one principal and seven district stations, which were to cost something like £13,000 a year. The Finance Committee asked them if they could give any estimate as to the ultimate cost, and they replied that they could not. The Finance Committee thereupon requested them to prepare such an estimate. What did they do? They merely dropped the whole matter for six months and then brought up this Bill, which contained a proposal for two stations—not eight—at a cost of £5,000 a year. It is pretty obvious what the reason of that proposal was. I asked Sir William Collins whether he could say that it was a satisfactory proposal or one that could last for any time, and he said—

"No, it is only a tentative proposal that will cost £5,000 a year."

He was then asked whether the Finance Committee were satisfied, and he said they had passed it, but were not, perhaps, entirely satisfied. Then I asked—

> "Why did you propose eight stations last year and only two now?"

He replied that perhaps their scheme of the year before had been too ambitious. Then I asked whether this had any reference to the pecuniary objection which the Finance Committee took the previous year, and he replied—

> "Yes, it has some reference to it, but it is not the special or, indeed, the only cause."

The London County Council propose to have two stations. They say they cannot give an exact estimate of what they are to cost, and they have no notion of what their scheme is ultimately to be. Indeed, they could not give us the faintest estimate of what the ultimate cost would be; and when the noble Lord says it may possibly ultimately cost £30,000 a year, I would point out that there is no reason, so far as this Bill was concerned, why the Council should not expend £300,000 a year if they saw fit.

Let us take the clauses. The noble Lord spoke about their intention to have two stations. That may be their intention, but that is not what is in the Bill. The clause which the noble Lord wishes to insert provides that—

> "It shall be lawful for the Council to establish and maintain or to contribute towards the cost of or otherwise aid in establishing and maintaining an ambulance service."

That is all that is stated. They may use any lands or buildings for the time being vested in them for any of the purposes of the Bill, and they may erect or acquire any buildings suitable for the purpose. This is done out of revenue, and your Lordships will remember that all expenditure out of revenue by the London County Council is not subject to the approval of Parliament. I asked one of the witnesses—Sir William Collins, I think it was—whether they would not require land for this purpose and to expend capital. He replied that it was a revenue expenditure. I said—

> "Surely a great deal of this is capital expenditure,"

and he replied that the Council had the land already. I asked him how he was going to provide buildings out of revenue, and he said they would be temporary buildings. He admitted that this was only the first experiment of a scheme, and he could not give me any estimate whatever, or any conjecture even, as to what the scheme was to be or what it was to cost.

I think I have said enough to show your Lordships that it was impossible to pass a scheme of this sort. There is no detail of any kind. This is a fair sample of the way in which the London County Council go about their business. The Highways Committee appoint a sub-committee to consider this matter; the sub-committee put forward a proposal; the Finance Committee object; the Highways Committee then withdraw the proposal for a time and again put forward a similar proposal, but when it comes to drawing up a Bill they take powers to incur any amount of expenditure which may seem fit. I do not see how a Committee of your Lordships' House could have passed such a scheme. That was our reason for rejecting it.

*VISCOUNT KNUTSFORD: My Lords, after what has been said by the Chairman of the Committee before whom this Bill was considered, your Lordships can hardly be asked to differ from the decision of the Committee. As one who has been interested for a long time in the ambulance service, having been Chairman of the St. John's Ambulance Association for some years, I should like to offer one or two observations and to suggest a matter for consideration during the ensuing year. I think it must be admitted on all hands that in a city like this, where the population is increasing by leaps and bounds, where the traffic also is increasing to such a great extent, and where there are accidents, not only every day or every hour, but every minute, in the streets, it is not creditable that we should be in a worse position than all the other great cities to which reference has been made, and that we should have no organised system of ambulances. I see great difficulties in handing this work over to the County Council, for the reasons which have been stated by Lord Camperdown, as well as that they have quite enough work on their hands.

But what I desire to have considered is whether there should not be a Bill introduced next year creating an ambulance board on which would be represented the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, all the hospitals and those other societies and associations that have supported ambulances, as well as representatives of the City and the Metropolitan boroughs, and the police. I think if you had an ambulance board of that kind it would have a double effect. In the first place, it would lessen expense by establishing an organised system, instead of having an overlapping of work by different bodies, and, in the second place, you would interest the public in the system, and thus, it may be hoped, lessen the expense of the Board by subscriptions from outsiders. I hope this suggestion may be taken into consideration, and that next year a Bill will be introduced with the assent of all who are interested in this very important question, and will receive the sanction of Parliament.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW): My Lords, I think I need only say one or two words about this Bill. At any rate, your Lordships will have gathered from the tenor of this debate that there is no difference of opinion on either side of the House as to the desirability of having an efficient ambulance service in London. The noble Earl the Chairman of the Committee stopped counsel and witnesses who were arguing in favour of an ambulance service by saying they were all agreed on that. The question before them was, who should provide an efficient system, and who should pay for it. Lord Leigh said that neither the police nor the fire brigade would have anything to do with it. I hope we shall hear a word presently from the noble Earl who represents the Home Office in this House as to what are the views of the Home Office on the subject.

The question asked by Lord Monkswell, "Why should London wait?" is one which has been put to us on many other points, and I think it was the tenor of the debate a few nights ago in your Lordships' House that the tendency of the London County Council is, if anything, one of rather too great speed. I cannot help thinking that the London County Council and the question generally will take no harm by waiting until another session of Parliament. It seems to me that the proper course would be that some ommunication or conference should take place between the Government Department which has control of the London Police, the London Fire Brigade, and the London County Council themselves, and if they see fit either to come to some arrangement for a joint management of the ambulance system or for the creation of an ambulance board, that will, I think, be a more satisfactory solution of the question than by rushing the matter in at this moment, and inserting these clauses, the financial effect of which is not at all agreed. I sincerely hope your Lordships will take time to consider the matter, and that we may have a well-matured and well-considered scheme for dealing with it next year.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, on behalf of His Majesty's Government I am unable to advise your Lordships to agree to the proposal of the noble Lord to reinsert the clause in the Bill. Your Lordships know quite well that it is within the power of this House to take such a step, but it would be a very unusual course to take on an occasion like the present. The chairman of this particular Committee is well known as one of the most experienced and careful Members of your Lordships' House, and His Majesty's Government, therefore, are unable to advise your Lordships to reverse the decision to which his Committee came. I venture to hope that the House will follow the same course with regard to another Amendment which is to be moved by the noble Earl (Lord Wemyss).

On behalf of the Home Office I have to say that in their opinion the scheme has not yet received that mature consideration which it should have before complete power is given to the London County Council in the matter. In the opinion of the Home Office another scheme for supplying ambulances to this city should not duplicate the present system, but rather supplement it; but under the clauses which were struck out of this Bill it was in the power of the London County Council to sweep aside the other agencies which exist at the present time and establish an entirely new system The opinion of the Secretary of State is that it would be better to follow the line of developing the present resources rather than by a revolutionary change to inaugurate an entirely new system. At the same time, the Home Office are not of opinion that improvement is impossible in this matter. They recognise fully that other countries have, perhaps, better ambulance services than we have, and they would be very anxious indeed, in co-operation with other public bodies which take an interest in the subject, to do what they could to improve the service in London.

I am afraid I cannot quite agree with the noble Lord who drew a somewhat melancholy picture of the condition of London at the present time in the matter of its ambulance service. There is a considerable amount of provision made already by the Metropolitan police; there are ambulances on wheels at every police station throughout the Metropolitan police district, and, further than that, there are also the necessary appliances for rendering first aid to the injured, and a very large number of the Metropolitan police force have obtained certificates from the St. John's Ambulance Association which enable them to render that first aid. I think it is a matter of great satisfaction that no less than 6,082 members of the police force should be qualified to render first aid. Beyond that, I may say there are 240 litters at police stations, and forty other similar ambulances and appliances are placed in other central positions. The police stations do provide special facilities in the case of injured persons, because they are able, with the aid of the telephone, to get into direct communication with the hospitals, and warn them to prepare for really dangerous cases.

I do not think that in discussing the question of the ambulance service your Lordships should be allowed to forget that, in addition to those I have already mentioned, there are a very large number of ambulances which deal only with cases of infectious disease. Those are the property of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, and some 32,000 people made use of them during the year 1904. Those two services are entirely distinct, and the litters which are used by the Metropolitan police are never used for the cases which come under the purview of the Metropolitan Asylums Board. In looking at the ambulance provision of London as a whole, one should not forget the large number of ambulances in the possession of the Metropolitan Asylums Board.

The Secretary of State is of opinion that the time has come when further steps might well be taken in order to improve the present condition of the ambulance service, and he has, therefore, summoned a conference of the three bodies concerned—the London County Council, the Metropolitan police, and the Home Office—to consider what should be done in order to effect this improvement. It is not unlikely that a Committee from these three bodies will be formed to deal with the question as a whole, and to formulate some scheme. Meanwhile, it obviously would be unwise for your Lordships to interfere with any such scheme by reintroducing the clauses which the noble Lord wishes to restore in this Bill. I venture to hope, therefore, that your Lordships will not concur in the noble Lord's suggestion, and that next year, by the consent of all the bodies interested, a thoroughly sound system will be introduced which will meet with the approval of everyone concerned

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: Might I suggest to the noble Earl, with reference to his last statement, that the Home Office should call the City Corporation into the conference? At the present time, according to their own statement, the City have a scheme which is in a somewhat advanced condition.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: I will communicate that suggestion.

LORD MONKSWELL: As to my statement that the City authorities were in favour of my Amendment, I think I ought to mention that I obtained that information from persons who I thought were likely to know, and looking at the evidence I find the statement by Sir Ralph Littler, on behalf of the City, that rating is the only question at issue between the City and the London County Council, and that if the question of rating was settled the City would be willing that the London County Council should have these powers. Therefore I had every justification for my statement as to the position of the City. I think this discussion has done a great deal of good. I am very glad that the Home Office are going to call this conference, and I am sure it can only have this result, that next year the London County Council will be able to set up an efficient ambulance service. I cannot agree with the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees that we on the London County Council are in this matter going at too great a speed.

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I did not say in this matter.

LORD MONKSWELL: I rather thought the noble Earl said that this was an instance of our going at too great a speed. Twelve months' delay will undoubtedly cause a great deal of preventable misery. I suggest that the Home Office are a little sanguine in supposing that the police deal in anything like an efficient manner with the provision of ambulances in cases of accidents. There is not one horsed ambulance under the command of the police which has persons in constant readiness to take charge of it. I hope the Home Office will not hug themselves with the belief that there are not very great improvements to be introduced into the present police scheme. It has also been suggested that we intend to sweep aside all the voluntary bodies which at present provide ambulance accommodation. The proof that we do not intend to do so is that we have specially committed ourselves on the Council only to spend £5,200 in the course of the first year. We intend to work as much as we possibly can in co-operation with the voluntary associations. In the circumstances, I will not press my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I move to leave out Clauses 27, 28, and 29 in Part V. Your Lordships had on this day week a very interesting, and, I hope, a very useful, discussion with regard to the Money Bill of the London County Council. In the Bill now before you there are three clauses which embrace the principle of municipal trading, and it is to these clauses that I specially direct your Lordships' attention. I think the clauses are objectionable as regards the private trader and as regards the ratepayer, and that they are not in the interest of the progress of the nation. As regards the private trader, if this Bill were to pass as it now stands it would practically oust all those who have to do with electrical fittings and wiring. It is proposed that fitting and wiring should be done by the local authorities.

There is a special clause to the effect that the borough councils are not to manufacture the fittings. But does any sane man doubt that next year or the year following, if you pass this now, there will be a Bill brought in to enable them to make these fittings? I venture to think that it is not in the interests of the nation that private trade should be driven out of the market by municipal or even State trading. That really is what is happening. As regards the ratepayer, he will be in great danger. I am old enough to recollect the day when every town was lighted, not by gas, but by oil. Suppose in those days you had had municipal authorities of the same ambitious character as the County Council. They would have had a fleet of whalers and would have brought their blubber here and made their own oil. Then came gas, and now electricity, and the cost of substituting these different supplies would have been saddled upon the shoulders of the ratepayers.

We are now perfectly satisfied with electric light, but the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition hit the right nail on the head when he said the other day that there is no limit to invention. What will happen? Some unknown illuminant may be introduced, and the electrical plant may become so much dead weight round the necks of the London ratepayers. I therefore venture to think that, in the interests of progress, of free trade, of private trade, and of the London ratepayer, this municipal trading ought not to be allowed. What does this trading mean? You have now at the head of the Local Government Board Mr. John Burns. What is Mr. Burns's view of municipal trading? Why, that everything in the shape of production and distribution should be in the hands of a labour-governed State. Therefore, I hold that every step in this direction is a step in the direction of State omnipotence. During a discussion some years ago at the Society of Arts, I put this question to Mr. Burns—

> "Do you, or do you not, mean that all the instruments of production are to be in the hands of a labour-governed State?"

Mr. Burns simply bowed his head and said "Yes." Therefore, whatever you do in this direction is leading to this end.

How does this question of municipal trading affect national progress? You are always in the infancy of invention. You have progressed hitherto in this way—Science discovers and invents, and public enterprise has taken up the invention and speculated upon it. But if, when the invention succeeds, it is to be seized by the State progress will be stopped, because if this is generally done no one will take up inventions. Therefore on this ground I respectfully ask your Lordships to reject these clauses. The discussions in your Lordships' House have been most useful in showing up the finance and general proceedings of the London County Council, but you want more check upon the action of that body. That check ought to have been in the original Act under which they were appointed. The compound householder ought to be got rid of, and then everyone would know what he was paying in rates. This it is impossible to know when the rates are included in the rent. You want an audit of the accounts of these corporations, and there ought to have been in the original Act a limit to their rating power. Instead of having their hands in everybody's pockets they ought to have been limited as to the rate they should be entitled to raise. If that had been done, instead of the rivalry which now exists as to which of them should have the biggest concerns, the rivalry would be as to which could do the most with the money at their disposal. There is another suggestion I have to make. It is that when a man has been elected to the London County Council he should have to pass an examination before a Government official in all the matters with which he professes to deal, and that there should be a special examination in ship-building and navigation. That strikes me as a very practical suggestion, and I throw it out for the consideration of the Government. These clauses were rejected in 1902 by a Committee of the House of Commons. In 1903 this trading power was again rejected, and, lastly, in 1905 it was rejected by a Committe of the House of Lords. I therefore venture to move the Amendment standing in my name.

Amendment moved.

> "In Part V (Supply of Electric Fittings by Metropolitan Borough Councils), to leave out Clauses 27, 28, and 29."—(*The Earl of Wemyss.*)

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: My Lords, I regret very much that after having been attacked just now from the left wing we are now attacked from the right. I can assure my noble friend that no one is more opposed to municipal trading as such than I am; but, with reference to this question of electrical fittings, it appears to me that it is to be looked at from quite a different point of view. The proposal in the Bill is that distributors of power and light should be allowed to supply the fittings by means of which that power and light are given. The power which we propose is not in any way a power of monopoly as against private traders. When either a private company or a public body distribute electricity, there are certain *prima facie* reasons why it is more convenient from the point of view of the consumer that they should also have the power of supplying fittings. If these clauses remain in the Bill it will be equally in the power of any consumer, just as at present, to employ a private trader and to have the fittings put in by him. Moreover, in the case of the supplying company or the supplying borough authority trading unfairly, there is an appeal to the Board of Trade, and, as was pointed out to us on the Committee, this has been found perfectly effectual. With regard to what the noble Earl said in defence of the ratepayers, these clauses were specially drawn by a Committee in a previous session of Parliament to meet objections which had been raised and to prevent the Council in any way putting down the expenditure incurred by them in supplying fittings under such headings as to charge it to their general undertaking. In the first place, there is the security that no council of any Metropolitan borough is to manufacture.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: Wait a year or two.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: But this does not apply to these boroughs only. The noble Earl must not suppose for a moment that these powers are being given to Metropolitan boroughs alone. They have been given to a great many boroughs and also to gas companies and other companies of the kind whose supply is to a very large extent connected with the fittings and apparatus by means of which the supply is given. You have to judge a matter of this sort very much on the merits of the particular case, and, with regard to these Metropolitan boroughs, many of the houses are very small—£20, £25, and £30—and there are a great many persons who take a supply of electric power who prefer to hire rather than to purchase. All the evidence before us went to show that the private companies, and even persons who supplied motors, were rather in favour of the purchase system, and were inclined, as far as they could, to encourage that system rather than the system of hire. It was pointed out to us that a great many small manufacturers using electrical energy wished to hire rather than to purchase. It is perfectly true that a Committee of your Lordships' House did reject this proposal, or one almost identical with it, in the last session of Parliament, but I believe I am speaking for the majority of the members of the Committee when I say that, considering all the circumstances of the case, we thought it expedient to allow these clauses to remain in the Bill.

LORD CLINTON: My Lords, the evidence which was brought before us this year was almost exactly similar to that which came before your Lordships' Committee in the year 1905. The witnesses were almost identical, and having served on the previous Committee as well as on this one, I could not detect much difference in the arguments. Yet the Committee of 1905 unanimously rejected the clauses, and the Committee this year, by a majority of four to one, allowed them to proceed. This, no doubt, is but a minor instance of municipal trading, but still the principle remains the same. It is the principle which has been very strongly objected to, not only by Members of your Lordships' House, but by a very large number of people outside, on the ground, chiefly, that the gradual absorption of private trading into the hands of municipalities is likely to produce a very serious evil, and if it becomes more general may lead to the great discouragement of almost all forms of individual effort.

I do not profess to be such a strong opponent of municipal trading as the noble Earl who has moved this Amendment. I can understand that in certain circumstances municipal trading is both justifiable and advantageous, but I think before the power is given it should be shown that the municipality wishes to embark on trading for the purpose of accomplishing some great public enterprise, and they should also, I think, be able to show that they can do it better than private individuals or public companies. But in the case which is now before us there was no evidence of the kind, and my whole point is that these great powers should only be granted by Parliament as an exceptional matter of very great importance. The evidence before us did not show that there was any necessity at all, in my opinion, for these borough councils entering into this form of trading.

The noble Earl who presided over the Committee this year, the Earl of Camperdown, has told us that it would be a great convenience for the public to be able to have their fittings supplied by the same people who supplied the power. I can quite believe that there is a convenience in that, but I do say that the convenience, such as it is, is not sufficient to outweigh the primary objections to the principle of this municipal trading. The London County Council showed in evidence that in certain cases the firms at present engaged in supplying electrical fittings were unwilling or unable to supply them to the smaller class of houses where only some ten or twenty lights were required, and, in particular, that they were unwilling to adopt what is known as the hire-purchase system. I believe that system is a great convenience and is very much desired by a large number of small users of electrical power, but I hold that the firms have a complete answer.

The firms stated that this system had been tried, and they found that it could not, in these particular cases, be carried out at a profit. They found that the attendant risks were too great. There was the risk of unpunctuality in payment, and the risk of the purchaser leaving his house and going to another locality before his payments were completed. If private firms have found it impossible to carry on this system at a profit, is it likely that a municipal authority will be able to do so? I do not think our past experience of municipal trading would justify us in coming to such a conclusion, and if the municipal authority cannot carry it on at a profit, ought they to be allowed to risk the ratepayers' money in attempting to do so? I hold that the passing of this Bill, while it would be a danger, would also be a very serious hardship to the large number of respectable firms at present engaged in supplying these fittings; that it would bring them face to face with the serious competition of a municipality which possibly, by the aid of the rates, would succeed in forcing them out of their district with the loss of their capital and without any compensating advantage whatever to the general public.

LORD LEITH OF FYVIE: My Lords, having been a member of this Committee, I would like to explain what influenced me in voting in the way I did. Personally, in a business sense I am opposed to municipal trading. But I think it is a misnomer to say that these clauses come within that category, because they simply continue the process of supplying the consumer and enabling that supply to reach the consumer. In two instances the manufacturers who came before us were quite willing to let the wiring go. They said there was no profit in it. We thought it would be to the benefit of the consumer, both from the point of view of convenience and expense, that this power should be given. I understand that there are several boroughs which have been given the power, and it has been found to work in a satisfactory way. On the other hand, I admit that Glasgow was given the power and has withdrawn it at the urgent request of contractors; but the principle remains the same, that the development of the supply largely depends on the facility with which fittings and wiring are carried out. Therefore we thought it right that the power should be given.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: My Lords, I may perhaps be allowed to say a few words on this point, as I was Chairman of the Committee which rejected these clauses last year. I do not know that I should have troubled your Lordships if it had not been for the speech of the noble Lord who has just sat down, which I confess seemed to me to be one of a very alarming character. It appears that the decision which the Committee has come to in this instance is based on the contention that the right of supplying the power should always be accompanied by the right of supplying the fittings.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: It is a concurrent power, not a monopoly.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Is that the accepted rule, the understood principle, upon which Committees have gone in the past? Is not that an entirely new principle altogether? No doubt in certain instances powers have been given to corporations, but they do compete seriously with the retail dealer. One curious recommendation by which the noble Lord supported these proceedings was that the operations could be carried out much more cheaply for the consumer by the local authority. What does that mean? It means that the retail dealer is to be unfairly competed with by the local authority, which has means of supplying articles at a lower price than the retail dealer.

LORD LEITH OF FYVIE: I was only referring to the wiring. The contractors themselves acknowledge that there is no money in it, and they do not care about the wiring.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: I understand that the power you will give in these clauses goes as far as the supply of motors also, and I must say I think this is rather an instance of very great abuse in the matter of our Private Bill Legislation. Promoters bring Bills forward year after year. Sometimes the whole Bill, and sometimes clauses of the Bill, meet with rejection at the hands of one or other House of Parliament. The promoters bring the Bills up again and again until at last they manage to do one of two things—either to drain the pockets of the opponents to such an extent that it is no longer worth their while to oppose the proposal, or else by some means to induce the Committee to pass and adopt it. There does not seem to be that continuity of policy in our Private Bill Legislation which there ought to be. I do not think it should be in the power of a body like the London County Council to bring forward year after year proposals of this kind, which year after year are rejected. No noble Lord has had more experience as Chairman of your Lordships' Committees than my noble friend Lord Camperdown, whose opinion is, of course, entitled to every respect; but it does seem to me that, perhaps through the case not being fully put before them, he and his colleagues have come to a conclusion absolutely opposed to that of four or five other Committees who have sat on this question. I do not think this should be possible, and for that reason, if for no other, it would be advisable for your Lordships to agree to the Amendment to strike out these clauses. I am a little alarmed at the arguments of my noble friend Lord Camperdown, and all the more alarmed because of his tried judgment and great experience in these matters. The noble Earl began by telling us that he was opposed to municipal trading, but that there were exceptional circumstances which now and then must be taken into consideration.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I said in this case.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: One of those circumstances was that the power was not to be a monopoly. But is that the whole objection to municipal trading? Is there no objection to municipal trading unless that trading is a monopoly? The objection to municipal trading is that it competes with fair commercial undertakings. I venture to think that anything approaching retail dealing should only be entrusted to local authorities in the most exceptional circumstances. The noble Earl said that one of the main reasons why these powers should be given to the London County Council was that they supply a large number of very small houses. That is a very wide-reaching reason. It is an argument which may be applied to every city and borough in England, and I do protest most strongly against doctrines, even proceeding from the noble Earl, so utterly subversive of what I believe has hitherto been the policy of Parliament.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, the Board of Trade see no reason why electrical fittings should not be sold by municipal bodies. They see no reason why bodies which are authorised to manufacture and sell electricity should not also have the advantage of being able to sell the fittings. In no case will they manufacture them, and, therefore, they will not be competing with private enterprise. My noble friend Lord Wemyss said he was afraid they would next year bring in a Bill for power to manufacture fittings, but I do not think there is any reason to fear that. Nearly every gas company has power to sell fittings, and a great many of the electrical lighting companies in the provinces also have that power. I therefore hope that in these circumstances the noble Lord will not press his Amendment.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: My Lords, I do not think your Lordships need be afraid that in the Chairman of the Committee which considered this Bill you have any dangerous socialist anxious to advocate collective rather than individual doctrines. The noble Earl, with the consent of the majority of his Committee, decided in favour of allowing these clauses, and I gather from the remarks he made that that action was taken on the ground that it would benefit the poorer classes. I have no doubt there is a great deal of difficulty in getting them to adopt any new system unless it is made extremely simple, and if they have to go to two authorities, one to light and one to wire, there is a difficulty in getting them to adopt what undoubtedly they would wish to have. I remember an American friend of mine, commenting on the position of the legal profession in this country, saying that in America they did not have the two classes, barristers and solicitors, because they could not afford there to be lathered in one shop and to be shaved in another. I think that is very much the case here: that these persons prefer to buy their electricity and their fittings from the same body.

The noble Duke who was Chairman of the Committee last year made some complaint against the course of Private Bill Business in your Lordships' House, and he pointed out that it was the practice to bring in proposals again and again until they were accepted by the House. I hardly think that in this case, at any rate, the argument of the noble Duke has much force, because there are already two metropolitan boroughs supplying fittings, and there are no fewer than forty-two provincial authorities who have clauses which enable them to supply fittings as well as electricity. I venture to think, if we are to refer to precedents, that they are rather on the side of the promoters of this Bill. As I said on the last Amendment proposed to this Bill, I am not one of those who always support a negative answer to the question, "Should London wait?" and I do not see why on all occasions London should come in last in the race. In this particular case I do not think the principle which the House has agreed to in connection with two metropolitan and forty-two provincial authorities is so dangerous that your Lordships may not safely extend it to the other boroughs within the area of the London County Council.

On question, Amendment negatived.

On question, Bill passed and returned to the Commons.

CORPORATION OF LONDON (BLACKFRIARS AND OTHER BRIDGES) BILL.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

On Question, Bill read 3^a.

*LORD WELBY: My Lords, as I am the only member of the Metropolitan Water Board who has a seat in your Lordships' House I have been asked to move the Amendment standing in my name. The object of the clause is the further protection of the Metropolitan Water Board and the gas companies, providing that in the event of damage to certain pipes from electric currents generated and used by the Corporation nothing in the Bill shall relieve the Corporation from the liability to make compensation. This clause was passed in Committee of the other House, and afterwards came up to your Lordships and was considered and passed by a Committee presided over by Lord Camperdown. I am under the impression that the clause was passed in your Lordships' Committee as an agreed clause, and I am not aware that any evidence was taken on the point. But after it had been adopted by Lord Camperdown's Committee the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees struck it out.

I know it is a very serious matter for a humble Member of your Lordships' House to ask you to reconsider any point of this kind which has been decided by so high an authority as the Chairman of Committees, but I understand that his decision was taken upon the ground that the clause was contrary to the spirit and intention of the Report of the Joint Committee over which Lord Cross presided some years ago. I am the last person to question the interpretation which Lord Onslow has put upon the practice of your Lordships' House, or to ask you to reverse that which on consideration he has thought proper to recommend; but I would point out how very desirable it is that promoters and those interested in the passing of Bills should know where they are. I should feel that I had no ground whatever for asking that this clause should be inserted were it not that there are so many precedents upon my side.

I believe I am right in saying that since the Report of Lord Cross's Committee no fewer than fifteen different bodies have obtained powers similar to those contained in the clause which the Chairman of Committees struck out of this Bill. It does appear to me that in such a case it is extremely difficult to justify the action of Parliament. If the recommendation of Lord Cross's Committee is the right one, and if the regulations made by the Board of Trade are sufficient to meet the case, that rule should be of universal application. There is no justification for granting one borough this protection and refusing it to another. It is upon that ground that I ask the House to take the question again into consideration, and I hope the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees will reconsider the decision he has come to in this case.

Moved, "After Clause 14, to insert as a new clause: For the further protection of the Gas Light and Coke Company, the South Metropolitan Gas Company, and the Metropolitan Water Board, the following provisions shall have effect: If it be proved that an injury or damage to any gas or water pipes or other metallic pipes, structures, or substances of either of the said companies or of the said board elsewhere than on Blackfriars Bridge between the northern and southern abutments thereof shall have resulted from fusion or electrolytic action caused by any currents generated and used by the Corporation for the purpose of electric energy under this Act, nothing in this Act shall relieve the Corporation from any liability to make compensation for any such injury or damage which would have existed but for the passing of this Act."—(*Lord Welby.*)

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: My Lords, I am sorry that I cannot ask your Lordships to comply with the request of my noble friend. This matter has been under very careful consideration, and was brought before your Lordships' House as recently as 1903. The Committee over which my noble friend Lord Cross presided in 1893 was a Joint Committee of both Houses, and had upon it Lord Rosse, Lord Russell, Sir John Brunner and others well versed in scientific matters. It came to the conclusion that this was a question which could safely be left to the Board of Trade, and it recommended a series of clauses to be inserted in every Bill providing that the Board of Trade should make certain regulations which would, in their belief, prevent any damage to the pipes of water or gas companies.

It is quite true that since 1893 a clause similar to that proposed by my noble friend on this occasion has been inserted in some Bills, but not, I believe, since 1903. In that year the Beckenham Urban District Council Bill came up to your Lordships' House with a clause similar to this in it, and a Motion was made that the clause, although it had been considered by a Committee of which the Duke of Bedford was Chairman, should be rejected; and your Lordships, contrary to your usual practice but with the sanction of the then Chairman of Committes, decided that the clause should not be allowed. This has been the practice from that time until now, and unless some scientific member of your Lordships' House is prepared to get up and say that the inventions and knowledge of electricity have so altered since 1893 that there is good reason for reconsidering the question, I think your Lordships would do well to adhere to the decision you arrived at in 1903, that in matters of this kind it is safe to rely upon the sufficiency of the regulations of the Board of Trade. So far as I know, the Board of Trade consider that they are quite able to discharge the duties that are to be put upon them, and I ask your Lordships to leave the matter in the hands of the Government Department.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, I think this short discussion illustrates, as the noble Duke observed just now, one of the numerous difficulties attending Private Bill legislation. This particular question of electrolysis is one which is perpetually occurring. Only last session the same point was raised in connection with a Torquay Bill, and the proposal was rejected by the House. It is perfectly plain that if the Amendment which the noble Lord has now moved is accepted it will cause additional complications in decisions of this character, and Chairmen of Private Bill Committees have quite enough difficulties to contend with already. If this Amendment is accepted it will create a fresh precedent whenever a Bill is promoted in which the interests of a gas company are affected in any way. In such a case opponents will plead for the recognition of this particular principle. But what I really rose to suggest was that it does seem to me most desirable that we should, if possible, arrive at what I may term uniformity of decision in such matters. This difficulty with regard to electrolysis will obviously continue to recur, and therefore I suggest that the Board of Trade should appoint a Departmental Committee, or that some similar steps should be taken in order to ascertain the real rights of the question and arrive at a satisfactory decision which shall be a guide to Committees in the future.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: My Lords, if the Board of Trade adopt the suggestion which has just been thrown out by my noble friend Lord Newton, perhaps they will also inquire into an action of their own in 1904, when they granted a Provisional Order containing the very clause which the noble Lord opposite now wishes to insert in this Bill. Although the Board of Trade are put forward as the proper authority to look after this matter they themselves, as recently as 1904, inserted in a Provisional Order for which they were responsible a clause similar to the one which is now thought unnecessary.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, there are two entirely separate questions before the House at this moment, one dealing with the merits of this particular case, and the other raised by my noble friend, Lord Newton, as to the practice of Private Bill Committees. As regards the practice of Private Bill Committees, I confess I have always felt that there is a certain danger arising out of agreed clauses. It sometimes happens that towards the end of a rather long and wearisome Committee the parties come together and bring up, in an agreeable and smiling manner, a number of agreed clauses which the Chairman of the Committee is very much tempted to adopt, and I think it occasionally has happened that somewhat unfortunate precedents have been created by that means. Of course, we look to the Lord-Chairman in such cases to keep a careful watch upon any departure from established precedent, and to deal with it in a manner which he, as an autocrat in these matters, is able to do by striking out anything which he considers objectionable in itself or creating an undesirable precedent. As regards this particular matter, I think my noble friend behind me was quite justified in bringing it before the House, but, in view of the opinion expressed by the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees, to whom one is always accustomed to look on these occasions, I hope my noble friend will not persist in his desire to reinsert the clause, and that he will agree to accept what I imagine would be the decision of your Lordships' House in supporting the Lord-Chairman in this matter.

LORD WELBY: After what my noble friend has just said I shall not put the House to the trouble of dividing on the the Amendment. I would only remind the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees that there were fifteen Bills in which this clause was inserted—two in 1900, three in 1901, six in 1903, two in 1904, and two in 1905. I venture to think that that point deserves the attention of my noble friend, as it gives the idea that there is not equal treatment between all parties. I think the suggestion made by Lord Newton is one which is deserving of the attention of His Majesty's Government.

*THE EARL OF ONSLOW: I will look into the precedents since 1903. What I said was that I was not aware that there was any precedent for the insertion ot this clause since your Lordships' decision in the full House in 1903. I shall probably find that the cases to which the noble Lord has referred were Provisional Orders, for which my Department is not responsible.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Bill passed, and returned to the Commons.

RUSSIA AND THE FLEET.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, seeing my noble friend the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in his place, I beg to ask whether he is able to give the House any information with regard to the abandonment by the Fleet of the proposed visit to Russian ports.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (LORD FITZMAURICE): My Lords, it having been intimated to us by the Russian Government that, in view of the political situation in Russia, the presence of foreign ships in their ports might give rise to agitations and incidents connected with internal affairs, it has therefore been decided not to proceed with the cruise as had been intended His Majesty's Government much regret that this visit of the Fleet has to be postponed, the more so as there would be difficulties in rearranging the remaining part of the programme; and it has therefore been decided to give up the intended cruise to the Baltic altogether, including visits to other ports.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION.

Petition in favour of denominational religious teaching in schools; of inhabitants of Firle signing; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3667. China (Hangchow).
No. 3668. Japan (Shimonoseki).
No. 3669. Brazil (Pernambuco).
No. 3670. Netherlands (Surinam).

INEBRIATES ACTS, 1879 to 1900 (SCOTLAND).

Report of the Inspector for Scotland under the Inebriates Acts, for the year 1905.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Statement showing syllabuses of religious instruction issued by diocesan and other associations for the use of Church of England schools.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Report of the Board of Education for the year 1904-5, on the administration of schools under the Welsh Intermediate Act, 1889.

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.

Order made by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries under the provisions of the above Act, for the variation of an order for creating the Northumberland Ses Fisheries District.

BANKRUPTCY.

Twenty-third General Annual Report by the Board of Trade, under Section 131 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated July 11th, 1906, declaring that Hugo Marinitch, C.M.G., Dragoman, His Majesty's Embassy, Constantinople, was appointed without a civil service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department.

POLLING DISTRICTS.

Order made by—

The council of the West Riding of Yorkshire constituting polling districts in the Elland and Doncaster Parliamentary divisions of the county.

The council of the borough of Stockton-on-Tees altering certain polling districts in the borough.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

CONVEYANCING BILL [H.L.].

SETTLED LAND BILL [H.L.].

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL [H.L.].

Read 3^a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

HORSE-BREEDING.

*THE EARL OF **DONOUGHMORE** rose to move to resolve, "That in view of the importance of the horse-breeding industry to the community in general, and of the necessity for an adequate and efficient supply of horses for military and other purposes, it is, in the opinion of the House, desirable that steps should be taken to improve the breeding of horses by giving effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on horse-breeding in their Tenth Report, especially to those having reference to the improvement of the quality of brood mares."

The noble Earl said: My Lords, I confidently appeal to your Lordships to allow me to trespass upon your patience this evening in regard to a subject of very great importance, and a subject in which I know many of your Lordships take very great interest. The horse-breeding industry is one in connection with which there are many peculiar circumstances, which I think admit of the Government taking special steps to deal with it—steps that they are able to take without any interference with certain economic theories which I know are held very strongly on the other side of the House and which are acted up to perhaps not quite so strongly. I take it that it will be granted on all sides that Government horse-breeding establishments such as are known on the Continent of Europe are in this country impracticable, and that it is infinitely more satisfactory, from every point of view, that the horse-breeding industry should be left in the hands of private individuals. But, in spite of that, there are many ways in which the Government can interest themselves in, and so indirectly benefit, the industry, and it is to some of those ways that I would ask to be allowed to direct your Lordships' attention.

We are fortunate in the fact that we have before us a great deal of information upon the subject. We have, first of all, the ten Reports of the Royal Commission on Horse-breeding—most valuable Reports—and I have also in my hand a document of very great interest, which I dare say has fallen under the notice of many of your Lordships, though it is not an official publication. It is a report of a special committee of the Hunters' Improvement Society which sat in the year 1904 and made some most interesting inquiries upon many branches of the subject. The members of the committee were all men well known as being thoroughly "up" in the subject. They made their inquiries by letter, and the evidence they collected went to show that whereas the breeding of thoroughbred horses, sires, and polo ponies is well looked after, that of hunters and the stamp of horse which is, after all, the Army stamp, shows an entire want of system and scientific treatment. The actual words of their Report are—

> "With certain marked exceptions the industry is now being pursued in a haphazard manner, without skill or organisation, and, generally speaking, with but moderate success."

I believe there are in existence Government Returns which show that the number of horses in this country has increased, but the evidence that was submitted to this Committee proves that whereas the total number of horses has increased the number of useless malformed, unhealthy horses has increased disproportionately to the increase in the total number of horses.

Three things would appear to be necessary to deal with the evils which we know to exist. The first is the provision of better sires. I know that something is already done in this direction. The State spends, I think, £8,500 a year—£5,000 in England through the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding, and £3,500 in Ireland through the Department of Agriculture. The £3,500 a year which is spent in Ireland used, I believe, to be spent under the direction of the Royal Dublin Society, but it has been recently transferred. This branch of the subject is a most difficult one to deal with, but I am happy in the knowledge that several members of your Lordships' House who are well skilled in its intricacies intend addressing your Lordships upon it after I have sat down, and therefore I am not going into the question in detail. But perhaps I may say, in passing, that the evidence of the Committee to which I have referred shows that the system under which the State at present spends this money annually in improving sires by the offering of King's praemia is popular with the farmers, that in their opinion the work is most satisfactorily done by the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding, and that on the whole the present accepted type of sire is approved of, though on this point opinions are not absolutely unanimous. I may perhaps mention, as a small proof of the fact that it is worth while giving attention to this subject, that Government Returns show that of 2,460 sires in Ireland alone only 662 are thoroughbred. 633 of the remainder are carthorse sires, and what this large number of carthorse sires are being used for in Ireland, I find it difficult to understand, unless they are contaminating the hunter blood.

The second thing which seems to be necessary is the provision of good mares. The Tenth Report of the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding, issued a year ago, stated—

> "We believe the time has come when something more should be done to improve the quality of mares. There is no doubt that much good could be done in this by your Commissioners, but with the small sum available for our use we find ourselves unable to deal further with this matter."

The Committee of the Hunters' Improvement Society, already referred to, draws special attention to the fact that good mares are being withdrawn from this country at an alarming rate, and that this country which breeds them gets no further use of them for breeding purposes. I do not, of course, suggest that we should go to the length adopted by some other countries, from which it is absolutely forbidden to export mares, but I think steps should be taken on a large scale to deal with this important part of the subject—a part which has hitherto been, until, at any rate, two years ago, neglected on all sides.

Two years ago a society was organised in this country—the Brood Mare Society—which has now issued its second Report, and I wish particularly to draw your Lordships' attention to the methods which that Committee has pursued, and pursued, as I hope I shall be able to show your Lordships, with success. The Committee commenced, of course, in a small way, but it has provided an organisation aimed at placing within the reach of the horse-breeding community mares of good stamp and quality at moderate cost, and the organisation has worked smoothly from the first. Its procedure is as follows. It obtains mares either by purchase or by gift, and I acknowledge gratefully that private owners have been most generous on the latter head. There are now fifty mares in this country in conditions which I will now describe to your Lordships under the ægis of the society, and twenty-nine of these have been presented to the society. These mares are given to farmers for breeding purposes under certain conditions, and local committees are organised to watch the intimate working of the system almost from day to day.

The rules of the society provide that the mare remains the property of the society, and has to be given up on demand. I need not explain the reason for that; it is pretty obvious. But the farmer may use the mare while in his possession for such work as she is capable of performing, having due regard to the foal and the period of foaling. She must be at all times properly cared for, and the local committee is responsible for seeing that this condition is fulfilled. The stallion employed must be selected or approved by the local committee, and all expenses are borne by the custodian—the farmer. All foals belong to the custodian if they are colts, but the first two fillies must be sold to the society, if the society requires them, for £35 at a certain age—I think it is three-and-a-half years—and the custodian is made to join the society and gets all these benefits for £2 a year.

Briefly the position is this. The farmer gets the mare for nothing, he feeds her, he breeds from her; the colts are absolutely his own, but the society has the option of purchasing the first two fillies at £35; subsequently all fillies are his own. We have now about fifty of these mares distributed in Leicestershire, Dorsetshire, Herefordshire, and Cornwall. Farmers eagerly accept the mares of the society. We have found that on a small scale suitable mares can be obtained, and that local gentlemen of knowledge and position are ready to help us on our local committees. We claim that the custodian of the mare gets good value for his money, and your Lordships will see that the power we have of purchasing the first two fillies at £35 a-piece gives us an opportunity of ensuring that these fillies shall be used in future for improving the general stock. We believe that the breeder appreciates this position just as much as the central committee of the society. This society has fifty mares under their system as the result of two years work, and I think it is highly creditable to them that they have not got one halfpenny of debt.

The Report of the Committee of the Hunters Improvement Society to which I have already referred shows that there was undoubtedly need for the formation of the society. One of the questions asked was whether occupiers of land would be likely to assist in the movement by which suitable brood mares should be provided by a central society under certain conditions for breeding purposes. The answers received were—favourable, 222; unfavourable, 126; doubtful, 118. I am glad to say that of the 118 who were doubtful, 100 were doubtful only because it was thought that there were practical difficulties. This committee sat in 1904, and the experience of the last two years has proved that these practical difficulties can be overcome. The next question asked was—

"Do you consider that there is a sufficient number of brood mares in your district suitable

The Earl of Donoughmore.

to breed light horses, and, if so, what is the approximate number?"

There were only seventy-five replies, out of a total of very nearly 500, which showed satisfaction with the present condition of things. I will only quote three or four at random. Here is a reply from Kent—

> "Plenty of brood mares, but no good for breeding."

From county Down—

> "A great number of brood mares, but, as a rule, they are animals rejected at sale. Everything that will pass the veterinary inspector is sold."

From County Wexford—

> "Farmers buy any mare, and chance the getting of a foal."

From Pembrokeshire—

> "No attention is paid to the mares. Farmers breed from any mares they happen to have."

From Yorkshire—

> "All good mares are bought by dealers every year, and, as a rule, sold to the foreigner.

These are typical answers. I cannot refrain from alluding to the last quotation from the evidence, which also comes from Yorkshire—

> "During the bad time twenty years ago, farmers parted with their old breeds that had been in Yorkshire for years and took to hackneys. They have now discovered their mistake."

I venture to say that any man who has had anything to do with hackneys deserves to be flayed alive.

I say quite openly and candidly to the noble Earl opposite that we want help from the Government. We claim to have it known that, beginning in a small way, we have provided an organisation which is workable and popular, and we think we are justified now in coming to the Government and asking them to help us to a certain extent. Our subscriptions up to the present time have amounted to £250, and the work we have accomplished has been done without incurring a halfpenny of debt. We are a cheap organisation, and claim that we are worthy of consideration and help from His Majesty's Government. We could be helped in many ways. We could be helped by an annual grant. It might be convenient, perhaps, that that grant should be given to the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding for mares, and they might employ our society as their agents. I throw that out as one way in which some assistance could be given.

But there is another way in which the Government could help us. Could they not persuade the War Office to let us have mares at ten or eleven years of age for breeding purposes, if not for nothing, at a small cost? As I have said, the committee of the Hunters' Improvement Society have ascertained that three-fourths of the animals purchased by the Government are scarcely ever permitted to return and reproduce their species. That is supported by my own experience at the War Office, when certain facts in connection with this matter came under my notice. I know it is the fashion for the War Office to keep horses and mares as long as a spark of work remains in them. That may be the cheaper policy at the moment, but I think it is on the whole a bad investment. The Government would do much better if they gave some serious attention to this matter and helped our society in the direction I have indicated. I would suggest also that they might take our three and a half year old mares at approximately the price we pay for them from the farmer, on the understanding that afterwards they give them back to us for the purpose of reproducing their species under our auspices.

I do not ask for a large grant. I know that the noble Earl opposite is a most liberal man, and those who were present in your Lordships' House a week ago know that he has large ideas as to what constitutes a small sum. I do not want the small sum which the noble Earl is content to see spent annually by the London County Council on steamboats, but I think he might help us, as I am sure he will if he can see his way to do so, in the direction I have indicated. A little would go a long way and would have an appreciable effect in the direction of retaining good strains of blood in this country.

Moved to resolve, "That, in view of the importance of the horse-breeding industry to the community in general, and of the necessity for an adequate and efficient supply of horses for military and other purposes, it is, in the opinion of the House, desirable that steps should be taken to improve the breeding of horses by giving effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding in their Tenth Report, especially to those having reference to the improvement of the quality of good mares."—(*The Earl of Donoughmore.*)

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND: My Lords, as one who has for many years, in fact, ever since its inauguration, had the honour of serving on the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding. I have much pleasure in supporting the Motion which has been moved by Lord Donoughmore; and in doing so I would like to say a few words in general on the subject to which he has alluded. I have felt for some time that the horse-breeding industry is in a most precarious position, notwithstanding that Government statistics show an increase in the number of horses bred in this country.

My reason for saying this is that I consider the advent of the motor car—a most useful and convenient mode of transit for those who can afford to own a motor car—cannot but have, sooner or later, a weakening influence on the horse-breeding industry in general. I doubt not that before very long several of the functions which horses at present perform in the streets of our large towns and also in our country districts will be carried out by means of petrol or some other chemical compound. Holding this opinion I think it is the duty of every one interested in the subject—the Government included—to do what they can to foster the industry, not only for the sake of the farmer and the horse-breeder, but also for national purposes. More especially is this the case when we take into consideration the fact that in all probability before very long the streets of London and other large towns will be filled with motor omnibuses, thereby decreasing the supply of that kind of horse which I am credibly told was one of the most useful animals during the late war in South Africa.

I cannot help thinking, my Lords, that one way of encouraging horse-breeding would be, as mentioned in the last Report of the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding, for the Government to buy their young stock at three years old instead of at four years old as, I believe, is now the general practice. The difficulty and expense to farmers to keep their young horses until they have turned four years old before selling them I believe to be very great. It is well known, too, that the expense of keeping a young horse during the winter between three and four years old is much greater than in the previous years of that young horse's life. The farmer in many instances, or, perhaps, I may say in most instances, cannot afford this, as the price he generally receives for his young horses rising five years old is one which does not usually pay him a due return for all the trouble and expense involved. After three years the young horse becomes troublesome and it is necessary to break him, which nowadays the farmer or the farmer's son is very often quite unable to do, and therefore it is necessary to relegate the young horse to the local horse-breaker.

In the old days when the agricultural industry was in a prosperous condition the farmer could very often afford to hunt and was frequently—in fact, more often than not—a really good horseman; but bad times have changed all this, and now, comparatively speaking, few farmers can afford the expense of keeping a horse to follow the hounds. I imagine that if the Government could be induced to buy their young horses for remounts and for other purposes at three years old instead of at four years old, and have those young horses taken in hand and carefully and systematically trained, not only would they thereby confer a great benefit on the farmer and the horse breeder in general, but I think we should hear fewer complaints of the decadence of the horse-breeding industry, hurried, as I fear it will be, to its end by the coming of the motor-car. My idea is that the Government should pay about the same price for an animal rising four years old, or what is known as three off, as they do now for one rising five. It might, in the first instance, cost a little more money, but the great advantage that would accrue would be that the Government would obtain an unbroken animal which could be trained according to scientific principles and the requirements of the present day, instead of a half-broken brute which most probably had acquired every possible kind of bad habit—habits most difficult and probably impossible to cure, and which sometimes render that animal totally useless for every practical purpose.

With regard to the work of the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding I think, considering the very small sum of money which has been at its disposal, it has done as much as it could to provide sound thoroughbred horses. It may interest your Lordships to know that the number of champion prizes, challenge cups, gold and silver medals, and other prizes won by the stock of the King's premium stallions at the chief agricultural and other shows in the country during the last eight years is no less than 3,131, or an average of about 391 prizes a year. Speaking of the horses I think, too, that the quality generally has much improved; and at the annual shows of the Royal Commission the number of unsound horses is certainly decreasing in a most remarkable way. I find that at the first show, held at Nottingham in February, 1888, sixty-four horses were submitted for examination and no less than thirty-four were rejected as unsound. In the next year, 1889, when the Royal Commission held its show at Islington, fifty-one were submitted for examination and seventeen failed to pass; whilst at the show in 1905—the last show which I personally attended—only three horses were rejected by the veterinary surgeons out of fifty-six examined; and from the classes confined to England only one horse out of seventy-five was rejected from the horses shown in those classes.

I am happy to think, my Lords, that many private individuals are doing and have done their best to keep good sound thorough-bred stallions for their tenants and for farmers, but undoubtedly the great difficulty is, as my noble friend Lord Donoughmore has said, the lack of brood mares. I have often, both in public and privately, urged farmers to keep half-bred males and also to breed from nothing but good sound serviceable animals. Nowadays, however, there is naturally a great temptation to sell good mares to pay the expense of a farm, and I regret to say that a deaf ear has generally been turned to my well-meant but seldom-listened-to advice. I still believe that in the long run it would pay farmers much better to keep their good mares and breed from them themselves than to yield to momentary temptation and take the first tempting offer which is made to them.

With regard to the Brood Mare Society, of which Lord Donoughmore, I believe, is president, I should like to say that I consider it has in view most praiseworthy objects, which should certainly be most generously supported. Personally I thoroughly approve of its objects and of its means of procedure, for it is carrying out a plan which some time ago I tried to inaugurate on my own property in the Midland counties. I trust I may not be thought desirous of self-advertisement or of calling attention to my own personal affairs—for such, I can assure your Lordships, is very far from my object—when I say that a few years ago, finding that, practically speaking, there were no serviceable brood mares for the production of half-bred horses on my estate, I had the greatest pleasure in purchasing in Ireland thirty-six brood mares to distribute to my tenants, with the idea of having a permanent stock of half-bred horses in the district where I live. I regret to say, however, that in most instances the colts and fillies—and I especially regret the loss of the fillies—have been sold, and those animals have been lost to that part of the country which I wished and intended to benefit.

But, my Lords, it is never too late to mend, and I am still trying to persuade my friends to keep the mares they breed, and I trust they will listen to my advice, especially as some of the produce of the mares I distributed have been prize-winners on several occasions. I trust this will induce their owners to keep them and to breed from them with the view of possible future gain. I am glad to note that the Brood Mare Society has by its rules safeguarded itself against the error into which I fell. The rule is that those who have mares given out by the society should keep the fillies they breed until three years old, and then return them to the society if the society so desires. I did not make a rule to that effect, and I am extremely sorry for it. I trust that the fillies bred from the mares which the Brood Mare Society have distributed may be kept by those who are lucky enough to possess them.

In conclusion, my Lords, without in any way pledging the Royal Commission on Horse Breeding, of which I am only a humble member, to adopt the methods of the Brood Mare Society, I must express the sincere hope that the Government will see their way to grant a further sum of money towards the encouragement—nay, towards the very existence—of the half-bred horse-breeding industry of this country, which I regret to think is now so grievously threatened, and which I think is likely to be practically extinguished if some further steps are not taken to give it new and increased life and vigour.

LORD RIBBLESDALE: My Lords, I welcome this opportunity of saying a few words in support of the Resolution which has been so ably moved by Lord Donoughmore, and, as a member of the Royal Commission since its appointment, I wish to associate myself with every word which has fallen from the noble Duke who acted for a great many years as the Chairman of that body and to whom the whole horse-breeding industry in this country is indebted for a great deal of zeal and unremitting devotion. As Lord Donoughmore has told us, and as his Resolution makes abundantly clear, more money for brood mares is the essence of this subject, and belonging as I do to the straightest sect of free traders, I can quite understand that noble Lords who sit on the Front Bench below me may ask, "How is it that you are able to reconcile your settled convictions with what is undoubtedly a bounty system and a request for an extension of the bounty system?" I quite admit that dilemma, and *de minimis non curat lex* is not an answer which I am prepared to give.

I should like, in this connection, to go back for a moment to the inception of the Royal Commission, and I think I may be able to say something which will be reassuring to the noble Earl on the Front Bench, the Minister for Agriculture, whose duty it will be, I suppose, to give the official answer to this Resolution. I remember very well, when first the question of appointing a Commission of this sort came into what I will call practical horse-breeding politics, going with the Duke of Portland to see Mr. Goschen, as he then was, and Lord Welby. We explained our position, and we were met by the difficulty of public money being asked for a bounty system. We were, however, able to run the gauntlet of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's objections, and our proposals having been most severely scrutinised, this public money was given to us. At first the sum of £2,300 was derived from Queen's Plate, and £1,000 odd from the Privy Purse, and the rest was made up by Votes on the Estimates; but since then, I believe, the whole of the grant has been put on the Estimates. I do not believe that Mr. Goschen would have admitted *de minimis non curat lex*. He would no doubt have said he would not break through his principles on that sort of ground. But he did break through his principles, because he recognised that we had put forward cogent reasons which justified the finding of money for this industry, which was pining for want of assistance.

The Duke of Portland.

One reason why mares are not forthcoming is that you have no longer high-bred idle mares in England, and you will never have good horses until idle mares are back with us again. What we really want is more help with regard to mares. The Brood Mare Society have set us a good example. Their plan seems to be a very good one. We have not as a Commission had an opportunity of coming into close relations with them, but we have had some correspondence, and their *modus operandi* seems sagacious and reasonable, and to have been crowned with as large a modicum of success as a small enterprise of that kind could hope to achieve.

I have been a member of the Royal Commission since its inception, when, in Mr. Goschen's phrase, he invited the noble Duke opposite and myself to guide its infant action, and so I can speak with some experience of the extreme faithfulness with which that Commission has performed the small services which have been entrusted to it. I asked the Secretary of the Commission to give me a short précis containing the substance of the proposals to the Commission from the Brood Mare Society. The last sentence is—

> "It is believed that the Remount Department and also the Board of Agriculture favour the plan of the Brood Mare Society, which offers a foundation on which to build further developments."

That is a fine, vague sentence, and I should be very glad to hear from my noble friend Earl Carrington that there is something in it. At all events, I feel that the future prosperity of the horse-breeding industry could hardly be in safer hands than in those of the present Minister for Agriculture, and I am sure that, as far as my noble friend is concerned, no pains will be spared to give effect, within the possible limits of political economy, to the proposals which have emanated from the Brood Mare Society, and which have been so ably stated by Lord Donoughmore.

LORD SALTOUN: My Lords, I confess that I listened with the greatest interest to the speeches that were delivered by the noble Duke below me and by the noble Lord opposite. In the days of my youth I remember hunting in my own country in the North of Scotland, but, after a time, hunting was given up. Fences were constructed, and instead of having a really good class of horse the whole breed deteriorated, and at the present moment it is almost impossible to get a horse of the class referred to in any part of that country. Some time ago a certain number of my tenants who joined the Yeomanry and required to get a lighter class of horse, asked me if I would provide them with a stallion. This I was glad to do, and the stallion I provided was very useful for several years.

But what I found was this, that the mares were so bad that it was almost impossible to effect any real improvement in the stock; at least, it would take many years before that could be done. For that reason I heartily welcome the suggestion which has been put forward by the Brood Mare Society. I think it will have a most excellent effect, and that it will open out a new industry in the North of Scotland. If more throughbred sires were sent up it would also have a great effect if they were mixed with Highland mares. I hope that the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture will grant the assistance which has been asked for the Brood Mare Society.

THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN: My Lords, I should like to say a word or two as to the best means of keeping good brood mares in the country. My noble friend Lord Donoughmore alluded to the stallions in Ireland. I think he rather exaggerated the case against them. I forget the exact number he mentioned as thoroughbreds. I cannot pretend to speak from any recent information, but I had the honour nine or ten years ago of being chairman of a Vice-Regal Commission which inquired into the question of horse-breeding in Ireland, and I think my noble friend will find that cart horses of quite a good class are reared in the North of Ireland for the purposes of the large towns, though not for agricultural work. I think he will find also that of the stallions that are not included as thoroughbreds a great number are perfectly suitable sires for getting hunters and horses of that description; in fact, I am confident that he will find on inquiry that some of the very best horses that have been bred in Ireland have been sired by stallions which, though practically thoroughbred, are not in the book.

Though speaking only from memory, I well recollect that over and over again in the Report of the Vice-Regal Commission to which I have referred the extreme injury being done to the industry in Ireland by the way in which the country was being denuded of brood mares was emphasised. It was not so much that the breeders, many of them small farmers, did not understand the advantages of breeding from a good mare, but that they could not withstand the temptation of the high prices they got from foreign buyers. I believe that the most cast-iron economist of the so-called free trade school will agree that if there is a danger of our home supply of horses for military purposes deteriorating it will be legitimate to take steps for safeguarding against a failure of the supply in the hour of need. I sincerely hope His Majesty's Government may be able to give some financial assistance to the scheme which my noble friend has mentioned. I think the most legitimate way of aiding this very desirable scheme would be by financial assistance, and I sincerely hope His Majesty's Government may find themselves able to give it.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, I desire at the outset to thank my noble friend behind me for the courteous and kind words he used as regards myself, and I need hardly assure your Lordships that everything I can do to promote this desirable object will be most willingly done. Noble Lords will have seen from the speeches that have been delivered to-night that it is generally agreed that horse-breeding in this country is not in a satisfactory state. As we have been told during the last ten years, there has been a sum of £8,500 annually spent, and I am bound to say well spent, by the Royal Commission.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND: Only £5,000 by the Royal Commission.

EARL CARRINGTON: Yes, £5,000 by the noble Duke's Commission and £3,500 in Ireland. The names of the members of the Royal Commission are sufficient guarantee that the expenditure of this money is in wise hands, and the result has been that the King's premium stallions have visited different parts of England and have covered mares at the rate, I believe, of £2. The amount of money at the disposal of the Royal Commission, however, compares unfavourably with the expenditure of foreign countries. I notice that in Italy £84,000 a year is spent; in Austria, £140,000 a year; in Hungary, £233,000; in Germany, £190,000; and in France, £308,000.

Although I would be the first to admit the good work done by the Royal Commission, I respectfully suggest some reconsideration of the scope of their work, and the desirability of bringing the War Office and the Board of Agriculture into their counsels. I hope this will not be considered as in any way an impertinent suggestion; I only throw it out in the hope that the good work done by the Royal Commission may be in some way extended. The horse-breeding question has not escaped the attention of the War Office itself. Last year the War Office and the Board of Agriculture were in communication upon the subject; and in February of this year a conference was held at which the attention of the Board of Agriculture was called to the scarcity of mares. The conference found that there was a considerable decline in the export of mares excepting during last year, 1905, but this is not so satisfactory as it seems, because the value of the mares exported averaged one-third more than the mares imported. It is, therefore, fair to assume that the foreign buyers are getting the best of our English mares.

Farmers are, as the noble Duke said, no longer able to keep the stamp of mare that is best suited for Army work, and one of the reasons given by the noble Duke was that they get a better price for hunters and harness horses. The War Office price for a four-year-old horse is certainly small. The consequence naturally is that the farmer gets rid of all the best horses he can for harness and hunting, and the failures are sold to the Army and become remounts. Again, as the noble Duke pointed out, very few farmers now hunt; very few of them keep a saddle horse, and of course that is a matter to be regretted.

Admitting the scarcity of mares, the question is, What is best to be done? As regards the Army I understand that in peace time there is absolutely no difficulty in getting remounts. About 5,000 horses a year are then sufficient. Some people rely on Yeomanry horses, but as far as my own experience goes it seems to me that Yeomanry horses are very much like the horses in a stage army—they appear over and over again. The Royal Bucks Hussars ride them one day; they then go over into Oxfordshire and are ridden by the Oxfordshire Yeomanry. As I have said, there is no difficulty in getting remounts in peace time; but what is to be done in the event of war? At the present moment there is no adequate reserve and no system to replenish waste, and all we have to depend on in case of war is a system of registration which I do not think is a great success.

We have had many practical suggestions made this evening. The noble Earl opposite has asked the Government to assist in the work of the Brood Mare Society. I do not doubt that that society is serving a very good purpose, and deserving of the very greatest credit for what they have done, but I am not certain that the price proposed to be paid for the first two fillies would be sufficient to tempt the farmers to accept the offer it is proposed should be made to them. The noble Earl then suggested that the War Office should give to the Brood Mare Society mares of eleven or twelve years of age. My experience of a cavalry regiment is that the colonel will not cast anything so long as it has legs to stand on. I am told that 75 per cent. of these animals are probably barren, and that others suffer from various defects so that to send those old ladies to the stud would be an expensive and disappointing operation. If my noble friend can get commanding officers to send these animals when there is still some work in them then, of course, there might be something in the suggestion. I think we are all agreed on the main point that it is desirable to encourage farmers to keep their best mares for breeding purposes, and that the Government should have some sort of lien on their progeny.

Then comes the question of identification. It struck me when the noble Earl was speaking that there should be some guarantee that the foal was the identical foal that came from the mare handed over to the farmer. That might be secured by the Australian system of branding. I was very glad to hear that the idea of a Government stud farm met with no favour. The noble Duke advised the Government to buy horses from farmers when they were three years old or rising four. The opinion of the noble Duke is very valuable and ought to receive every consideration, but I believe there are objections to that course. I would point out that the War Office Committee which sat in 1902, and was presided over by Lord Stanley, recommended that the Government should not buy any horses under five years old; and I think that to buy horses younger and to keep them for a year would materially add to the expense. The practical question is, is it worth while for the Government to encourage the breeding of certain classes of horses; is it right that money should be spent against the dearth of horses in the event of a great war, and that a large reserve should be kept up as an assurance against what we all hope is a very remote contingency, or should the country wait and "buy through the nose" if such a contingency should arise? It is really a question of expense. If more is to be done in encouraging the breeding of these horses, of course more money must be provided. But I am not Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I cannot pledge the Government to any future expenditure. I should be very sorry to say a single word which would look as a pledge that this extra expenditure would be entertained; but I think that if there is a general consensus of opinion on both sides of the House, and if we can produce a well thought out scheme, it certainly would go some way to induce the Treasury to provide the necessary funds to carry out so desirable an object. I do not think I am going too far when I say that the state of things at the present time is almost of a dangerous character, and that some remedy is absolutely necessary.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: My Lords, I feel sure your Lordships will not contradict me when I say that this debate has been of a very interesting character, and has shown the absolute necessity of the Government's doing something to improve horse-breeding in this country. The noble Earl who called attention to this matter to-night stated his case with the greatest lucidity and ability, and I am sure the sympathetic character of the speech of the noble Earl who has just sat down must have been received by him with gratification. If there is one Member of His Majesty's Government better qualified than another to deal with this subject it is my noble friend, who has had experience in the Army and as a master of hounds, and knows full well how important the breeding of good horses is to the agricultural community.

The noble Duke pointed out that it might be advantageous to buy horses at an earlier period, and I think that suggestion might commend itself to His Majesty's Government. I have frequently tried to convince agricultural audiences in those parts of the country with which I am associated that if they wish to counteract depression in certain branches of agriculture they can do so by breeding and rearing the best of stock, and I think the debate to-night will go far to encourage that idea. The noble Duke, who speaks on this subject with an authority which is almost unequalled in this House, drew attention to the fact that since the King's premium horses have been located in the country unsound horses have more or less disappeared from competition in the great shows.

THE DUKE OF PORTLAND: I said the number had been reduced to a great extent.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: I think that speaks volumes for the good results of the action taken by the Royal Commission for the purpose of stamping out unsound horses. But what is the use of providing the country with first rate stallions unless you have the best of mares? Undoubtedly the best mares have left this country as a result of agricultural depression, and I welcome the statement of the noble Earl that he will impress upon his colleagues the necessity of doing something to retain mares in this country. It seems to me that the Brood Mare Society are going a long way in the endeavour to provide suitable mares.

I was a Member of the Vice-Regal Commission presided over by my noble friend Lord Dunraven, and I remember then that the question of appealing for a sum of money to retain good mares was rejected by us. It may seem inconsistent that I should have gone back on that. But at that time we did not consider, in view of the purpose for which the Commission was held, that we were in a position to ask the Government to incur this expenditure. With regard to the identification of the animals, I think the local societies can be trusted to continue and extend the present system of marking, which would be quite adequate. I thank the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture for his sympathetic speech, and I hope he will not allow the matter to remain there. I know the difficulty of extracting money from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but if the noble Earl represents the absolute necessity of helping agriculture at the present time I do not think the Government will be behindhand in giving assistance.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 16*th July*, 1906.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill.

Ordered (under Section 9 of The Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899) to be read a second time upon Wednesday.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords]; Gas Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [Lords]; Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords]; Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill [Lords]; Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill [Lords]; (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill [Lords]. Read the third time and passed, with Amendments.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Cardiff Gas Bill (by Order); Manchester Corporation Bill (by Order). Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill [Lords] (by Order). Adjourned Debate on Second Reading [9th July], further adjourned till Wednesday.

Shoreditch and Stepney Electricity Bill (by Order). Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Metropolitan Electric Supply Bill (by Order). Read a second time, and committed.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill [Lords]. Read a second time; and ordered to be considered To-morrow.

Kent Electric Power Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP I).

Mr. TOULMIN reported from the Committee on Group I. of Private Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, at Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill, Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for preventing by agreement with the present owners of certain lands in the administrative county of London the future erection of buildings and structures on such lands; and for other purposes." [London Squares and Enclosures Bill [Lords].

London Squares and Enclosures Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Petitions against; From Loughton; West Felton; and Wigan; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL (RELIGIOUS TEACHING).

Petition from Chadderton, against alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

POISONS AND PHARMACY BILL [LORDS].

Petitions from Great Yarmouth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA, WARLIKE OPERATIONS (KILLED AND WOUNDED).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 28th May; *Mr. Morton*]; to lie upon the Table.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 3rd July; *Mr. Lloyd Morgan*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 257.]

POLLING DISTRICTS (BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Stockton-on-Tees altering certain Polling Districts in the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire constituting Polling Districts in the Elland and Doncaster Parliamentary Divisions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

INEBRIATES ACTS (INSPECTOR'S REPORT) (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report of the Inspector for Scotland, under the Inebriates Acts, for the year 1905 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ALLOTMENTS (SCOTLAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd March; *Mr. Eugene Wason*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 258.]

SEA FISHERIES REGULATION ACT, 1888.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, under the provisions of the said Act, for the variation of an Order for creating the Northumberland Sea Fisheries District [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Statement showing Syllabuses of Religious Instruction issued by Diocesan and other Associations for the use of Church of England schools [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF EDUCATION (WELSH (INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION ACT, 1889).

Copy presented, of Report of the Board of Education for the year 1904–5 on the Administration of Schools, under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 259.]

SUPERANUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 11th July 1906, declaring that Hugo Marinitch, C.M.G., Dragoman, His Majesty's Embassy, Constantinople, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND).

Return ordered, " showing the amount paid in each quarter of the period from the 1st day of April 1900 to the 28th day of Fbruary 1905 to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society in respect of each officer of the society whose services were utilised by the Department in giving instruction in agricultural subjects and organising agricultural home industries and agricultural audit societies."—(*Mr. Dillon.*)

DIPLOMATIC REPORTS (COAL).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 12th March; *Mr. Fenwick*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 260.]

BANKRUPTCY.

Copy presented, of Twenty-third General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 261.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3667 to 3670 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 19) Warrant, 1906, dated June 28th, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Return ordered, " (I.) of the Companies registered during the year ended the 31st day of December 1905 which filed a prospectus and to which certificates to commence business have been granted, stating—

(1) the date of registration.

(2) the date of the prospectus.

(3) the amount of the nominal capital.

(4) the amount of each share.

(5) the amount issued or to be issued otherwise than for cash.

(6) the amount offered for subscription in cash.

(7) the amount underwritten.

(8) the commission for underwriting.

(9) the minimum subscription required.

(10) the amount allotted before commencing business.

(11) the amounts per share payable on application and allotment.

(12) the total directors' share qualification, if any; and

(13) the date of the certificate to commence business.

(II.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1905 which filed a prospectus, but to which certificates to commence business have not been granted, stating the particulars specified in (I.) so far as they are applicable.

(III.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1905 which filed a declaration that the Company "does not issue any invitation to the public to subscribe for its shares."

(IV.) Of the Companies registered during the year 1905 which have not filed a prospectus or a declaration that the Company "does not issue any invitation to the public to subscribe for its shares," and stating the particulars specified in (I.) so far as they are applicable.

(V.) Of the Companies which were dissolved or struck off the registrar during the year 1905.

(VI.) Of the total number of Companies dissolved during the year 1905 (1) by order of the Court; (2) after voluntary liquidation; and (3) pursuant to the provisions of Section 7 of The Companies Act, 1880, and Section 26 of The Companies Act, 1900.

(VII.) Of the total number and nominal paid-up and considered as paid-up capital of the Companies registered during the year 1905 in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin respectively, distinguishing limited Companies from unlimited, and Companies registered with a nominal capital from Companies registered without such capital.

(VIII.) Of the total number and paid-up capital, including the amounts considered as paid on vendors and other shares, of all Companies having a share capital which were on the register on the 30th day of April 1906, except such Companies as were in course of liquidation or removal from the register under the provisions of Section 7 of The Companies Act, 1880, and Section 26 of The Companies Act, 1900.

(IX.) Of the total number and nominal capital of the Companies registered in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively in every year since the commencement of The Companies Act, 1862, to 1905, inclusive.

(X.) Of the fees and capital duty paid in respect of Registered Companies during the year 1905."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Sale of Grazing Farm at Leefin.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any complaint has reached the Estates Commissioners in connection with the sale of a large grazing farm in the townland of Leefin, parish of Balamana, Loughrea, by the landlord, Mr. John Smyth, of Loughrea, to Mr. Patrick Farrell, of Leefin; whether he is aware that Mr. Farrell is a large agricultural tenant on the same property; and whether the Commissioners, before sanctioning the sale, will institute inquiries as to the number of small holdings in the neighbourhood and the necessity of enlarging them out of this grazing farm.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that this farm consisting of 330 acres, forms portion o. the estate of Mr. J. Smyth, which they have agreed to purchase under Section 6 of the Act. Mr. Farrell, who is yearly tenant of the farm, has, upon the suggestion of the Commissioners, consented to give up sixty-nine acres of it for the purpose of enlarging the three holdings on the estate which require enlargement. The remainder of the farm is being sold to Mr. Farrell. He has no other holding on the property which is being sold. The arrangements for the purchase and re-sale of the property have been completed.

Sale of a Grazing Farm on the Darcy Estate.

Mr. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if an agreement form to purchase the grazing farm of Caramina from the trustee to the Darcy property, situate in the parish of Balamana, Loughrea, has been filed with the Estates Commissioners by Mr. Martin Farrell; whether he is aware that Mr. Farrell is an agricultural tenant on another property, holding over 100 acres of prime land; and whether, in view of the number of small holdings in the neighbourhood, he will advise the Commissioners not to sanction the agreement until such time as the small holdings are made economic out of this grazing farm.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the farm referred to was part of the estate of Anne Kelly and others, which was purchased by the Commissioners under Section 6 of the Act of 1903. Martin Farrell was tenant of the farm which contained some 160 acres. At the request of the Commissioners he offered to give up twenty-two acres of the land to be divided between two tenants on an adjoining estate who were anxious to have their holdings enlarged. These tenants refused to take the twenty-two acres unless all the land were surrendered by Farrell and divided. The Commissioners accordingly sold to Farrell the whole of the farm occupied by him, and it has been vested in him. The Commissioners understand that Mr. Farrell has another farm on another property.

Riverside Open Spaces.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that trees have been planted upon the Custom House Quay, and that seats have been placed there by the Metropolitan Public Gardens Association, and that for many years past the quay has been used daily by large numbers of the public for fresh air and recreation during the spare moments of their day's work in the warehouses and offices adjacent; whether he is aware that there are less than half a dozen riverside spaces from the east of Blackfriars Bridge to the county boundary, and these only of small extent, to which the public have access; whether he is aware that the City Corporation possess an adequate site for fish-market purposes at Shadwell, which has not hitherto been developed; and whether, under these circumstances, he will decline to accede to the request of the City Corporation and the fish merchants of Billingsgate that he should grant the use of the quay for fish-market purposes, which would necessitate the destruction of the trees, the removal of the seats, and the exclusion of the public from one of the few riverside spaces which they at present enjoy in the eastern part of the Metropolis.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The subject is receiving my careful consideration; but I have not yet given any reply to the request of the City Corporation. I shall certainly not fail to have due regard to the important aspect of the Question to which the noble Lord refers.

Local Taxation.

Mr. MORRELL (Oxfordshire, Henley): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the recommendations made by the Royal Commission on local taxation five years ago and the admitted urgency of this Question, the Government contemplate taking any steps to deal with it.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The Question referred to by my hon. friend is engaging the careful attention of the Government.

Native Killed by Soldiers in Egypt.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information to the effect that a native was killed by British soldiers near the village of Sersena, on 13th June last; whether a secret military inquiry is now being held; and, if so, why the inquiry is secret, and why is it not held by the ordinary tribunal.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The dead body of a native was discovered at Sersena, and it was alleged that the deceased had been chased and struck by two soldiers. As British soldiers are only amenable to martial law in Egypt, the matter has been dealt with by a military court of inquiry, but the information obtained does not point to the conclusion that the man was killed by a soldier. I believe that such inquiries are not usually held in public.

Sentence on the Rev. Edgar Stannard.

MR. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government has been informed of the sentence passed upon the Reverend Edgar Stannard by the court at Coquilhatville, Congo Free State; and if His Majesty's Government will place Vice Consul Armstrong's full Report on the Table of the House when it is received.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) His Majesty's Government have not yet heard officially of the sentence passed upon the Reverend Edgar Stannard by the court of Coquilhatville. The question of placing Vice-Consul Armstrong's Report on the Table of the House will be considered as soon as it has been received.

Denshawi Affray—Papers.

MR. DILLON: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when he will lay upon the Table the Papers promised in connection with the Denshawi affray, and the subsequent trials and executions.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) My right hon. friend hopes to be able to lay the Papers some time next week. The detailed account of the evidence will, however, not be included, as there has not yet been time to translate it.

MR. DILLON: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any, and, if so, what, further measures in addition to the executions, floggings, and imprisonments already carried into effect have been adopted against the villagers of Denshawi in consequence of the events of 13th June.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The village of Denshawi has been deprived of an Omda and has been attached to the adjacent village of Abu Kullos. The former village watchmen have been dismissed, and other watchmen sent from Cairo to take their places.

El Azhar University Police Force.

MR. DILLON: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government of Egypt have decided to station a force of police within the precincts of El Azhar University; and, if so, on what grounds this step has been decided.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) At the request of the authorities of the El Azhar University the police force for preserving order in and about the university was recently increased.

Compulsory Purchase of Holding by Patrick McGlone.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, what action he proposes to take in the case of Patrick McGlone, of Aghanlish, Largydonnell, county Leitrim, who was compelled by the Estates Commissioners to purchase his holding from them at a price which is thirty-eight and a-half years' purchase of the rent fixed by the county court judge.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have not yet arrived at a decision in this case, in which legal questions of difficulty are involved. As I have already stated, they are considering whether they shall take steps to test the decision of the county court judge in the case. The matter is not one in which action on my part is called for.

Irish Land Purchase Act—Sporting Rights.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state if the Estates Commissioners have yet taken any steps to render Section 13 of 3 Edw. 7, c. 37, workable, and particularly with regard to subsection 3 of said section; and, if so, will he state what are the conditions under which the Commissioners are prepared to dispose of the mining and minera rights; and has any transaction under this sub-section 3 taken place.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The question of issuing regulations upon the subject of the sporting rights vested in the Land Commission under the section quoted is under consideration. As regards the mining rights, it was decided by the Judicial Commissioner, in a recent case referred to him by the Estates Commissioners, that the Land Commission have no power to deal with or dispose of the mines and minerals vested in them until authorised so to do by statute. The question of undertaking the necessary legislation is receiving the attention of the Government.

Enlargement of Holdings on the Roo Estate.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners propose to enlarge the holdings on the Roo estate, annuitants to the Government, near Gort, county Galway, out of the untenanted lands purchased from Mr. Shawe-Taylor.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the townland of Roo does not appear to be on the estate of Mr. Shawe-Taylor, but on that of Mrs. A. C. Maxwell, the untenanted land upon which has already been divided. The Commissioners have not yet received from their inspector the proposed scheme for the division of untenanted land on the Shawe-Taylor estate, and until this scheme has been received and considered the Commissioners are not in a position to say whether land will be available for persons other than the tenants on the estate.

Sale of the Lambert Estate, Athenry.

MR. DUFFY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Estates Commissioners have received a copy of a resolution passed at a representative meeting of the Athenry people on Sunday, 8th July, setting out that the Lord Chancellor and the owners of the Lambert property, Athenry, are agreeable to sell to the tenants; is he aware that the tenants made an attempt to buy, but that, owing to the price demanded by the receiver, Colonel Lopdale, namely, twenty-five years' purchase, the negotiations fell through; and whether, having regard to the willingness of both sides to negotiate a sale, he will advise the Estates Commissioners to try and effect a settlement.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have received a memorial from the Athenry town tenants on the estate of Lamberts Minors. The Commissioners are at present in correspondence with the receiver of the estate with a view to purchasing it under Section 6 of the Act of 1903, and thus effecting a settlement of the case.

Foreign Firms and Army Meat Contracts.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a number of contracts, during the period of the supply of home-fed beef, were held by the nominees of other people who are interested in Foreign lairages; whether he will cause an examination to be made of these gentlemen's accounts with the various carrying companies from Woodside Lairage, Birkenhead, to the several Army stations from which they have held contracts; whether he intends to take any measures in regard thereto; and whether he will consider the advisability, at the expiration of the existing contracts, of making arrangements to receive home-produced animals, sheep and cattle, alive, and allow the soldiers to do the necessary work at the various stations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It does not appear that an inquiry into the working of expired contracts, which would hardly be practicable, could serve any useful purpose. As regards the last part of the Question there are at present four stations at which cattle are slaughtered by the troops, and it is not proposed to increase the number.

Yeomanry Drill Book.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that Yeomanry are mounted infantry, as distinct from cavalry, and that at present Yeomanry have to learn their drill from the cavalry drill book, much of which is quite useless and some of it quite wrong for mounted infantry, so that it has to be corrected by various supplementary papers, causing confusion and difficulty, and in view of the fact that Yeomanry training is extremely short, he will, in the interest of Yeomanry officers, non-commissioned officers, and men, consider the advantage of issuing a drill book containing plain definite instructions for Yeomanry training.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Imperial Yeomanry are not included in the category of mounted infantry but are trained to be capable of performing all the duties allotted to cavalry except those connected with shock action. Their *role* is clearly defined in the instructions for the training of Imperial Yeomanry which were drawn up after very careful consideration. No confusion or difficulty has been created, and no complaints of the present methods of instruction have been received at the War Office from the general officers commanding in chief.

Sanitary State of Egyptian Towns.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will consent to the Return being given of copies of the correspondence between the hon. Member for Canterbury and the Foreign Office on the affairs of Egypt and the sanitary state of Cairo and other towns of Egypt.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) I do not consider that any useful purpose would be served by printing this correspondence and presenting it to Parliament. As I have already informed the hon. Member, the authorities in Egypt are fully alive to the importance of improving the sanitary conditions of the towns, and the matter is one which will not be lost sight of.

Civil Service Boy Clerks.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many boy clerks were appointed by the Civil Service Commissioners during the year ended March 31st, 1906; how many secured permanent positions in His Majesty's Civil Service; and how many, during the same year, were dismissed on attaining the age of twenty.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I am informed that in the year referred to 762 boy clerks were added to the register. Two hundred and six boy clerks were removed from the register on being certificated for permanent appointments in the Civil Service, and in addition twenty-four left to take up appointments under Government of a quasi-permanent character or permanent public appointments not in the Civil Service. I understand that probably a considerable number obtained permanent positions after ceasing to be boy clerks, but it is not possible to say how many. The number of those removed from the register on attaining the age of twenty was 273, inclusive of boys who resigned their appointments as boy clerks very shortly before attaining the age of twenty.

Grievances of Assistant Clerks in Customs Statistical Offices.

MR. THORNTON (Clapham): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he has received the memorial forwarded in May last by the new class of assistant clerks in the Statistical Office, Customs; and, if so, whether he can state what steps have been taken to secure to the memorialists similar treatment to that enjoyed by their colleagues in other departments.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The case of those clerks was fully considered early in the present year, and certain improvements were authorised in the scheme of promotion to superior posts. A further memorial on the subject has recently been received in the Treasury and is now under consideration. With regard to the last words of the hon. Member's Question, the conditions of employment in the Customs Department are necessarily determined with reference to the requirements of that particular service.

Post Office Savings Bank Accounts.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether any non-interest bearing accounts in the Savings Bank Department are transferred to the dormant ledgers, or whether all interest-bearing accounts are kept in the ordinary ledgers, no matter how long since the books were forwarded for examination or actual transactions took place on them; and, if so, whether he will cause all accounts on which no actual transactions have taken place, or the books forwarded, for a period of five years to be transferred to the dormant ledgers, an index of the names of these depositors kept, and a list periodically published, in order that the legal representatives of all deceased depositors may have facilities for claiming moneys due to them by the Savings Bank Department.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that, owing to the fact that no index of depositors' names is kept in the Savings Bank Department, and that no list has ever been published showing unclaimed balances to the credit of depositors who have not forwarded their book for examination or deposited or withdrawn money for a number of years, sums of money are in the hands of the Government which the legal representatives of many of these depositors are entirely unaware of, whilst others find it very difficult to claim under the present system, unless they can supply particulars of deceased depositors' books; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I may, perhaps, answer these Questions together. There is no regular system of transfers, either of interest bearing or of non-interest bearing accounts to dormant ledgers in the Post Office Savings Bank. As I informed the hon. Member on July 3rd,† I am not prepared to sanction the compilation and publication of a list of accounts that have not been operated on for a given period, nor the preparation of a general index of depositor's names, as I consider that the expense and inconvenience that would attend these undertakings would more than counterbalance any advantage to depositors that might be derived from them.

Refreshments at Kew Gardens.

Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if his attention has been directed to the character and price of the refreshments supplied by the contractor at the Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew; and whether he will make such arrangements as will ensure that the public are better served in this respect in future.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) Very few complaints have been made with regard to the refreshments at Kew. The prices charged are low, and constant supervision is exercised by the Office of Works over the quality of the food and the character of the service. But I shall be very glad to cause further inquiry to be made if my hon. friend will let me know more precisely in what respects he considers that there is room for improvement.

Kew Gardens—Official Guides.

Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if his attention has been directed to the fact that the only guides to be obtained at the Royal Botanical Gardens are detailed sectional official productions and an inadequate non-official production; and whether he will give instructions for an official guide to be prepared for sale at say 3d. or 6d., which will describe and illustrate the contents of the gardens in broad outlines and in simple but accurate terms.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The preparation of an official guide to Kew Gardens has kindly been undertaken by Sir William Thistleton-Dyer, the late director, and it will be completed and placed on sale at the earliest possible date.

Capital Punishment.

Mr. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many sentences of death were passed in Great Britain during the ten years ending 1860, 1870, 1880, 1890, and 1900, respectively; how many of such sentences were duly carried out; how many commuted to terms of imprisonment; and how many were remitted altogether.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clix., 1600.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The following Table gives the particulars desired for the years 1851 to 1900, inclusive:—

Period.	Total death sentences.	Number executed.	Commuted to.				Free pardons.	Respited and removed to Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum.
			Transportation.	Penal servitude.	Imprisonment.	Reformatory detention.		
1851–1860	584	111	266	180	20	1	4	—
1861–1870	286B	137	—	135	4	—	6A	2D
1871–1880	283C	156	—	111	2	—	1	12
1881–1890	300	158	—	113	6	—	1	22
1891–1900	246	142	—	95	—	—	—	9

Notes: A. One conviction quashed by Court for Crown Cases reserved.
B. Two prisoners under sentence of death committed suicide.
C. One prisoner under sentence of death committed suicide.
D. This figure includes one case sent to Bethlehem Hospital.

Accidents Caused by Motor Traffic.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is now able to state what has been the number of accidents to or caused by motor omnibuses in the Metropolitan area; and what has been the number of accidents caused by other motor vehicles since the last figures given to the House.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am not clear to what figures my hon. friend refers in the last sentence of his Question. The subjoined Table gives particulars of motor omnibus accidents in the Metropolitan Police district for the months of May and June, the last two periods for which the figures have been collected. I have arranged for the monthy and yearly collection and tabulation of these particulars in the future, so that statistics will always be readily available.

	May.	June.
Accidents caused by motor cars (including motor cycles) - - - - - - - - -	556	559
Number of these accidents which caused personal injury - - - - - - - - -	169	178
Number of these accidents which proved fatal - -	4	4
Accidents caused by motor omnibuses - - - -	400	390
Number of these accidents which caused personal injury - - - - - - - - -	62	80
Number of these accidents which proved fatal - -	2	3

Irish Railway Clearing House Returns.

MR. FIELD: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can arrange that the latest Returns of the Irish Railway Clearing House be laid upon the Table of this House, and containing information as to the making of preferential through rates in Ireland; whether he will set out in the Return the apportionate payments made to Continental, British railways, shipping companies, and Irish railways respectively; and whether he will ensure that the ordinary rate chargeable from Dublin shall be specified in the Return, so that a comparison shall be possible between the through and local inland rates.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am not able to give a Return of the nature suggested. Beyond the provisions of Section 33 (5) of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1888, under which in certain circumstances the apportionment of through rates between the sea and land portion of the route is required to be set out in the rate books kept for public inspection, carriers are not required to disclose the division of through rates amongst themselves.

Testing of Motor Omnibuses.

MR. CHANNING: To ask the President of the Local Government Board in what way and by what officials the safety of the construction and equipment of motor omnibuses for street traffic or for use on country roads is now tested; whether certificates of fitness for the traffic specified are now issued after any such testing and inspection; and whether he will consider the advisability of forthwith strengthening the law and the administrative requirements and powers so as to better provide for the security of the public.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) In the Metropolitan Police district stage carriages of all kinds, including motor omnibuses, are inspected and licensed by the police. Motor omnibuses, like other omnibuses plying for hire, in urban districts outside the Metropolitan Police district are licensed by the urban district council, and in connection with such licensing are liable to be inspected. No formal certificates of fitness for the traffic specified are issued. The suggestion in the last part of the Question will not be lost sight of.

Irish Railways and Canals—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is intended to appoint the Inquiry Committee on Irish Railways and Canals between the House adjourns; whether a time limit for Report will be made; and whether the Committee will be granted extensive powers as to taking evidence and sitting in various centres in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Commission of Inquiry into Irish Railways has already been appointed. The terms of reference and names of the Commissioners were published last Friday. No time limit for Report has been fixed or could be fixed. The Commission have the usual powers of taking evidence in whatever places they think fit.

Extension of Allotments Act to Ireland.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the House of Commons unanimously passed a Resolution in favour of extending the Allotments Act to Ireland; and whether he will consider the advisability of introducing the measure at an early date.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The hon. Member doubtless refers to the Resolution made on the 13th of April 1894, in which the House expressed the opinion that the facilities for obtaining land possessed by England should be extended to Ireland. I would, however, remind the hon. Member that since then a great deal has been done by the Labourers' Acts to give effect to the principle of the Resolution, and the Bill at present before the House will, when it passes into law, hasten the provision of labourers' cottages and plots. The precise provisions of the Allotments Acts are hardly suitable to the circumstances of Ireland.

Sale of Rockfield Farm, County Westmeath.

MR. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Cleary, the owner of Rockfield Farm, near Streamstown, county

Westmeath, was willing to sell it to the Estates Commissioners for distribution amongst the poorer tenants, and that on communication with the Commissioners they replied that as the land was encumbered they could not buy it for distribution; and can he say if incumbrances debar purchase.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed by the Estates Commissioners that the farm in question was purchased by the occupying tenant under the Land Act of 1903. The Commissioners are, by Section 9 (4) of the Land Purchase Act of 1891, precluded from making advances for the purchase of land already purchased under the Land Purchase Acts and still subject to the payment of a land purchase annuity. The Commissioners, however, can purchase in such a case if the lands should be discharged of all encumbrances. They have, however, received no intimation that Mr. Cleary, the present owner of the farm referred to, is prepared to sell it freed from encumbrances, but if such an intimation should be made to them they will consider the question of purchase.

Irish Local Authorities Accounts.

MR. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the date upon which the abstracts of the closed accounts of the respective public bodies in Ireland are required to be forwarded to the Local Government Board or their auditor preparatory to commencing audit of their accounts; the dates upon which the respective audits were commenced in respect of the half years ended 30th September 1904, and 31st March 1905; the dates upon which the respective accounts were certified as audited by the Local Government Board's auditor; the fees for such audits paid by the respective public bodies; and the salary paid to each of the seventeen Local Government Board auditors for the year ending 31st March, 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) Article 25 of the Public Bodies Order, 1904, requires that the abstracts of the accounts of public bodies in Ireland shall be forwarded to the Local Government Board within four weeks after the close of each year or half year as the case may be. The preparation of a Return giving the information asked for in the second and third part of the Question would entail a great deal of trouble, and would occupy a considerable time. In the opinion of the Local Government Board such a Return would not serve any useful purpose, because any conclusions which might be drawn from it would be misleading for the reason that, owing to adjournments, interruptions, and the manner in which the accounts are presented, no accurate comparisons between the time occupied upon the audits of the accounts of different bodies, or even between the times occupied upon the audits of the accounts of the same authorities for successive periods can be instituted. If the hon. Member should see fit to move for a Return by counties of the fees recovered by the Local Government Board from public bodies for auditing accounts, I will offer no objection. The salaries of the auditors will be found in the Civil Service Estimates.

Ballinakill Oyster Fishery Banks.

MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Ballinakill, county Galway, oyster fishery banks were declared public property some seventeen years ago by the Rev. Mr. Green, Fishery Inspector to the Congested Districts Board, and that the rights and privileges secured to the people in the neighbourhood by that declaration are now threatened by an application for a licence for one of these banks by a Miss Duane and for another by a Mr. Gilmour Browne; and whether steps will be taken to protect the rights of the people in regard to these banks.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I am informed that Mr. Green did not at any time make a declaration as to the extent of the public oyster beds in Ballinakill Harbour, nor has he power to do so. Applications for licences to form oyster beds in parts of this harbour were recently made by Miss Duane and Mrs. Browne. The statutory public inquiries were held by Mr. Green, who is the officer to whom the Department of Agriculture have assigned this duty. He was satisfied that no substantially profitable public fishery for oysters was carried on in areas for which the licences were desired, and licences to Miss Duane and Mrs. Browne are being prepared. Appeals to have the licences vacated may, within one month of the date thereof, be made to the Lord-Lieutenant in Council. The areas affected by the proposed licences were formerly the site of licensed oyster beds, but the licences were revoked on account of the non-cultivation of the beds.

Prisoners Detained in the Clifden Bridewell.

MR. O'MALLEY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of persons detained for one or more nights in the Clifden Bridewell during the last twelve months; what is the annual cost in connection with this bridewell; and whether, in view of the fact that criminals can now be quickly conveyed to Galway Gaol by train, he will consider the desirability of closing the establishment or selling it.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The number of persons detained for one or more nights in the Clifden Bridewell during the last twelve months was twenty-one. The estimated cost of maintaining the bridewell is £68. The whole of this sum would not be saved by closing the bridewell, as there would necessarily be a larger expenditure than at present for the escort and conveyance of prisoners to and from Galway Prison which is fifty miles from Clifden; and, in addition, the detention of police escorts in Galway for the night would be necessitated. The question whether it may be possible to close the bridewell will, however, be considered.

Tullycross Police Barracks.

MR. O'MALLEY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the peaceful condition of the district for some considerable time past, and of the fact that the police barracks at Letterfrack are only three miles distant, the police barracks at Tullycross, county Galway, will be discontinued; and if he will state the number of cases the four or five policemen at this station have had during the last year.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The police station at Tully, which is three miles from Letterfrack, is situated in a populous district. The locality, however, has been reported as peaceable for some time past, and the question of the necessity for continuing the station will shortly come up for consideration. The number of prosecutions by the police at this station during the past year was fifty-one.

Purchase of Captain Caldbeck's Estate, Ballacolla.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have made any offer to Captain Caldbeck, Ballacolla, for the purchase of his estate; and, if so, can he say with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have not yet made an offer for the purchase of his estate, but with a view to doing so, they have referred the matter to their inspector, whose report has not yet been received.

Suggested Grant for Construction of Cunnigar Bridge and Roadway.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a memorial signed by the chairmen of the Dungarvan urban and rural district councils and others on behalf of these councils, urging the importance of the construction of the Cunnigar bridge and roadway, and asking for a grant for the purpose of £15,000; whether his attention has been called to the memorial presented to the Secretary of State for India, when Chief Secretary for Ireland, on the same subject; and whether he will be able to make a personal investigation during the present year into the merits of the proposed works, having regard to the advantages which it is claimed will accrue from their construction.

(*Answered by Mr. Bryce.*) I have received the memorial referred to, and as I have already informed the hon. Member, have examined the memorial which was presented in 1894 to the then Chief Secretary. I have obtained reports upon the proposal to erect a bridge or causeway at the Cunnigar, and these lead me to doubt whether the benefit to be obtained would be commensurate with the very large expenditure which would be necessary. In any case funds for works of the kind are not at present available. I shall be glad to visit the Cunnigar when opportunity offers, but am not able to say when that may be.

Poor Law Commission—Irish Medical Member.

MR. O'SHEE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the vacancy which has arisen on the Poor Law Commission by the death of The O'Conor Don, and of the dissatisfaction which exists in the medical profession in Ireland, owing to its having hitherto been unrepresented on the Commission, he will consider the advisability of appointing an Irish medical man to the vacancy.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) I cannot see my way to adopt the hon. Member's suggestion.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Prime Minister whether the late The O'Conor Don was a member of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws relating to the United Kingdom; and, if so, will he, in filling the vacancy, have regard to the wishes of the Irish Poor Law medical profession by appointing an Irish medical member.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*): I cannot see my way to adopt the hon. Member's suggestion.

Colonial Marriages.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): To ask the Prime Minister whether he can inform the House at what date the Government propose to bring forward the Colonial Marriages (Deceased Wife's Sister) Bill, sent down more than four weeks ago, and for the third time, by the House of Lords.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*): The position in which this Bill stands on the Order Paper will give my hon. friend a general indication of its prospects.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Sparkbrook Factory

MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): On behalf of the hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when did the negotiations with the War Office for the sale of Sparkbrook first begin; and what progress had been made in such negotiations when the late Government went out of office.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.): Negotiations for the sale of Sparkbrook began on November 1st, 1905, by letter and by interview at the War Office. On November 15th the Army Council informed the Treasury that they thought it desirable to enter on negotiations for this purpose. These negotiations were engaged on and proceeded with up to the day on which the late Government resigned.

Garrison Artillery Militia.

COLONEL WALKER (Lancashire, Widnes): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a Garrison Artillery Militia regiment, such as the Lancashire Artillery, having been trained for many years in the highly specialised work of drilling with the elaborate and scientific armaments in the Horsesand, No Man's, and Spit Forts, in the Solent, is to be included in the number of those Garrison Artillery Militia regiments who are in the future to form the ammunition train of the Field Artillery.

MR. BUCHANAN: In accordance with the policy of allotting the Garrison Artillery Volunteers to coast defences, the services of Garrison Artillery Militia will not be required unless they avail themselves of the invitation to form a Field Artillery Reserve. It must be pointed out that the Volunteers have the advantage of being able to train all the year round and in the works they will have to man in time of war.

Coldstream Guards.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): On behalf of the hon. Member for West Marylebone, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware of the expenses which will fall upon married officers of the condemned battalion of Coldstream Guards owing to their proceeding to Egypt for the winter in response to the appeal from the Government; and whether, in view of the special circumstances of the case, the

Government will be prepared to contribute towards those expenses.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The various arrangements involved in the decision to despatch this battalion to Egypt have not yet been worked out in detail. I am not, therefore, in a position to give the hon. Baronet any definite reply to his Questions.

Processions in India—The Bande Mataram.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): On behalf of the hon. Member for Tower Hamlets, Stepney, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the fact that, on the first occasion on which the Bande Mataram processions were allowed under the new rules to perambulate the streets of Dacca, the people taking part in the procession assembled in front of the English church during service and shouted the song to such an extent that the Commissioner of the division, who was officiating, was unable to proceed with the service; and whether it is intended to take any steps so to regulate these Hindu processions as to prevent persons belonging to other religions being molested.

*The UNDER-SECRETARY for INDIA (Mr. John Ellis, Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): Under existing orders, the cry of "Bande Mataram" may be prohibited where it disturbs public worship, and the Secretary of State has no doubt that the local authorities will take such steps as may be necessary to put a stop to this form of annoyance.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: On behalf of the hon. Member for Tower Hamlets, Stepney, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the song of Bengal, known as the Bande Mataram, is distasteful to the Mahommedans, who form the majority of the population of the new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam; and whether, considering that the song was only composed in 1882 and has since then seldom been sung, even during Hindu national festivals, it is intended to adopt any measures to prevent a breach of the peace between Hindus and Mahommedans in Eastern Bengal.

*Mr. JOHN ELLIS: As I stated in reply to a Question on July 4th, the cry of "Bande Mataram" may be prohibited, under existing orders, where it would cause such feeling in the Mahommedan population as would be likely to lead to a breach of the peace. The Secretary of State does not think that further orders are required.

Sir H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): Has the hon. Gentleman any reason to believe that the song in question is distasteful to the Mahommedan population.

*Mr. JOHN ELLIS: That is a matter of opinion. My hon. friend had better give notice if he desires a reply.

Executions of British Soldiers in India.

Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that a public execution of a private in the 1st Lincolns took place between the prison and the cemetery at Trimulgherry on September 1st last; that the station orders issued by Brigadier General E. O. F. Hamilton, C.B., commanding Secunderabad and Bolarum, on that occasion required the attendance of detachments of every corps, British and native, in the station; that the scaffold was erected a few hundred yards from a public roadway and in view of the windows of the cell in which the man was lodged prior to his execution, and that in the walk from the prison to the scaffold he had to pass through crowds of natives and white women and children assembled to see the execution; and will he say what action he proposes taking in the matter.

The hon. Member also had the following Questions on the Paper on the same subject. To ask the Secretary of State for India why the soldier of the 1st Lincolns tried at Secunderabad last year for murder by a general court martial was not handed over to the civil authorities and tried at the High Court at Madras.

To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will reconsider the sentence of penal servitude for life imposed on a corporal of the 2nd Border Regiment by a general court martial in Burmah last year, for attempted murder, with a view to its mitigation, and explain why this case was not tried by the Chief Court at Rangoon.

To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the fact that station orders, issued by a Brigadier General at Bolarum on August 30th last, contained paragraphs following each other, the effect of one being instructions for a general parade to witness the execution of a private in the 1st Lincolns, the next announcing regimental sports to be held by that battalion and the officers giving an at home; and whether he proposes to take any action with regard to the holding of a fête in the regiment twenty-four hours after the public execution of one of its men, which one company had been forced to witness.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS replied that the matter was receiving the attention of the India Office, and the Secretary of State was not yet in a position to give an Answer to the Questions.

MR. LEA said that on May 30th he addressed a Question to the Secretary for War, who stated on June 18th that he was making inquiries. He asked if instructions would be given to the Commander-in-Chief in India that no white soldier should be executed under such barbarous circumstances.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Or native soldiers, either.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: This is a matter for the Secretary of State. I will convey to the right hon. Gentleman the suggestion of the hon. Member. We are, I can assure him, in communication with the Indian Government on the subject.

MR. LEA: Will you cable out to India and ascertain if any British soldiers are now under sentence of death, and if so will you give provisional orders that the execution shall not be conducted under these barbarous circumstances.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: And also inquire as to native soldiers.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: I can give no pledge of that kind.

Scotsmen and Indian Public Appointments.

SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether any, and what, proportion of the appointments recently made to the Public Works Department of India by the Secretary of State on the recommendation of a Committee of Selection were given to Scotsmen or to engineers educated at Scottish universities and institutions; and whether Scotland is represented on the Committee of Selection.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: Out of the twelve men who were recently selected for the Public Works Department (one of whom resigned), four were of Scottish parentage and three were educated at Scottish Universities. I do not think that any one of the three members of the Committee of Selection is a Scotsman; but made no inquiry as to their nationality.

Natal Government—Bill of Indemnity.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether a Bill of Indemnity has passed its Second Reading in the House of Assembly in Natal; whether by one of the provisions of this Bill, officers and agents of the Natal Government are indemnified for acts that may still be committed as well as for those that have been committed; and whether such a provision has hitherto been inserted in Acts of Indemnity.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): A Bill substantially in the form described by my hon. friend has been introduced in the Natal House of Assembly, and the Secretary of State is now communicating with the Governor on the subject of its provisions, for some of which there is no modern precedent.

Opium Revenue Collection.

MR. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the abuses to which the farm system for the collection of opium revenue in the federated Malay States, Singapore, and Hong Kong has given rise, he will consider the advisability of making any alterations in the respective systems by which the sale of opium is now licensed in those countries.

MR. CHURCHILL: The system of farming the opium revenue has frequently been considered, and it has been held to be the one best adapted to the circumstances of these communities, in which there are no import duties and no Customs establishment available for collecting them. The Secretary of State is not aware that the system has given rise to abuses, and, in the light of past experience, he does not, as at present advised, see what alterations could usefully be made.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): In view of the opinions expressed by the Secretary of State for India, will the Government not consider the desirability of putting an end to the production of opium in British possessions?

MR. CHURCHILL: I must have notice of that Question. It refers apparently to a speech which I should see before replying.

MR. A. ALLEN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will give a Return as to the quantity of opium consumed and the amount of revenue derived therefrom during the last ten years in the federated Malay States and Singapore.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Governor of the Straits Settlements will be asked to supply the information.

East African Protectorate.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now state when it is proposed to establish a certain amount of representative or Crown Colony government in our East African Protectorate.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State proposes at an early date to advise His Majesty to issue Letters Patent providing for the establishment of a Legislative Council in the East African Protectorate, which will include unofficial members nominated by the Crown.

The Chief Nana.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now state whether it has been decided to allow the chief Nana to return to his own people and country after the long punishment he has received.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has decided, upon the advice of Sir Walter Egerton, to permit the chief Nana to return to Southern Nigeria and to settle at a town called America in Bonin River. A compassionate allowance of £10 a month will be paid to him for two years, after which it is expected that he will be able to support himself.

Dismissal of British Teachers from Cape Colony.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the action of the school board at Maraisburg, in Cape Colony, on which the Dutch have obtained a majority, in dismissing all the English teachers in the schools of the district; and whether he will bring this matter to the notice of the Government with a view to safeguards being introduced in the new constitutions of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony against injustice being done to British officials in those Colonies.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have seen a newspaper statement to this effect. The general position of British or other officials likely to be affected by the forthcoming constitutional changes in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies will certainly not escape the notice of His Majesty's Government so far as that is not inconsistent with the general principles of responsible government.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): But, Sir, will the hon. Gentleman take immediate steps to ascertain whether this outrage has, in fact, been committed.

MR. CHURCHILL said he should himself hesitate to accept, upon such testimony as they had before them, the word "outrage" which the right hon. Gentleman had used in regard to a proceeding of local government in a responsibly governed Colony.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Does the hon. Gentleman mean us to understand that the turning out of all the teachers in a British school in a British Colony because these teachers are English is not an outrage?

Mr. CHURCHILL said he had answered fully the Question on the Paper, and if the right hon. Gentleman wished to put further Questions, perhaps he would give notice.

Mr. LONSDALE asked whether the hon. Gentleman would promise to make special inquiries concerning this report.

Mr. CHURCHILL said he was quite unable to make a promise of that kind himself. He was bound to consult the Secretary of State on the matter; and if the hon. Gentleman would put a Question on the Paper, he would have the opportunity of conferring with the Secretary of State before giving an Answer.

Outrages on the Rand.

Mr. MACKARNESS (Berks, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is now in possession of information enabling him to say whether on Saturday the 7th July the house of a white man in the Rand district was attacked by Chinese and Kaffirs, the man robbed and injured and his wife outraged, dragged across the veldt, and again outraged; and whether the perpetrators of the alleged outrage have been arrested.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State has not yet received a reply from Lord Selborne to the telegram addressed to him on the subject.

Japanese in the Transvaal.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the subjects of His Majesty the Emperor of Japan enjoy the same rights and privileges in the Crown Colony of the Transvaal as the subjects of the German Emperor.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: All Asiatic races are subject to certain disabilities which do not apply to Europeans.

British Indians in the Transvaal.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the word native in the Treaty of Vereeniging includes His Majesty's Indian subjects; and, if so, whether His Majesty's Indian subjects are entitled, as natives, to acquire freehold property in the Transvaal.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: I have previously explained to the hon. Member in an Answer to a Question on March 15th† that it was asserted that the proposal to admit British Indians to the franchise was a breach of the spirit, if not of the letter of the Treaty of Vereeniging, which engaged that the question of granting the franchise to natives would not be decided until after the introduction of self-government. The late Secretary of State felt bound to take account of this view and accordingly stated in his despatch of March 31st, 1905, that, having regard to the terms of peace, His Majesty's Government had been unable to make provision for the representation of any of His Majesty's coloured subjects. Under the special law applying to Asiatics, Law 3 of 1885, British Indians cannot be owners of landed property save only in the streets, wards, and locations which the Government shall for sanitary purposes point out for habitation.

Labour Recruitment in Africa.

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now state whether licences for the recruiting of native labourers on the east coast of Africa or elsewhere have been issued to any persons other than the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association; and, if not, will he state what is the cause of the delay.

*Mr. CHURCHILL: No fresh licences have, so far as I am aware, been issued at present. The issue of licences, I would remind the hon. Member, is primarily a matter for the Portuguese Government, and negotiations are now proceeding with the object of obtaining equal recruiting facilities for other corporations of established responsibility. No undue delay is anticipated.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliii., 1400.

Cotton Duties in South Africa.

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the recent increase in the duties upon English cottons imposed by the South African Colonies applies to goods now on the high seas and shipped before the increase was made known.

*MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir. Under the law of the Cape Colony, Transvaal, and Natal when an increase is made in the Customs duty on any article after the conclusion of a contract for the sale or delivery of such article and no special provision for the increase is made in the contract, the seller, having paid the increased duty, may add the amount of the increase to the price and is entitled to be paid the amount and in case of default to sue for and recover it by process of law.

Religious Services in Malta.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state when the correspondence between the Government and the Governor of Malta as to the prevention of the Reverend John M'Neill from holding religious services in Malta at the request of the Roman Catholic archbishop will be laid upon the Table of the House.

*MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State is in correspondence with the Governor on this subject, and I hope to be able to answer the hon. Member's Question on Thursday, when it is expected that a despatch from Sir Charles Clarke will have been received.

MR. CORBETT: Will the complete correspondence be laid on the Table of the House before the Colonial Vote is taken?

*MR. CHURCHILL: I shall be glad for the House to have the fullest possible information on a matter which excites interest in more than one quarter, but I am not sure how far it is possible to publish the whole correspondence. I will examine it from that point of view.

MR. CORBETT: I will put the Question again on Thursday.

Emigration to British Colonies.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether effect is to be given to the recommendations of the Departmental Committee on Agricultural Settlements in British Colonies, by reorganising the emigrants information office under the title of the Emigration Office, by extending its functions as suggested by the Committee, and by increasing the annual grant-in-aid sufficiently to provide for the necessary increase of permanent staff.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is intended that the substance of the Report shall form one of the subjects to be discussed at the forthcoming Colonial Conference; and in the meantime His Majesty's Government do not propose to come to any decision on the recommendations made by the Committee.

Slavery in Zanzibar.

*SIR C. HILL (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government propose to apply to the mainland dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar, now administered by His Majesty's Commissioner for the East Africa Protectorate, provisions similar to those brought into force in Zanzibar and Pemba in 1897 for the abolition of the legal *status* of slavery.

MR. CHURCHILL: I would refer the hon. Member to the reply which I gave on May 30th to a similar Question by the hon. and gallant Member for West Dorset, a copy of which will be sent with the typewritten reply to this Question.†

Turco-Egyptian Frontier.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information as to the progress of the negotiations for the delimitation of the Turco-Egyptian frontier; and when it is expected that the work will be completed.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury—for Sir EDWARD GREY): I am unable to add anything to the Answer given to the hon. Member for Blackpool on July 3rd. last, viz.: that the delimitation is proceeding on the spot.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 388.

Egyptian Schools.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether in the secondary Government schools of Egypt, as a result of the British control, religion is not taught and the Koran is not read, notwithstanding the fact that 92 per cent of the population are of the Mohammedan confession.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Religious instruction is not given in the secondary Government schools in Egypt. This has always been the practice, and it is in no way due to interference on the part of the British authorities.

Field of Waterloo.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the plans which are in contemplation for the development of the field of Waterloo as a building estate; and whether he will make representations to the Belgian Government with a view of insuring the preservation of the historic features of the battle ground.

MR. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend has seen a statement in the Press from which appears that little historical interest attaches to the farm at Waterloo which has been sold. I do not think that representations on the subject need be made to the Belgian Government.

Abandonment of the Baltic Cruise of the British Fleet.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) asked if the Government had any information to give as to the proposed visit of the British Fleet to Russian waters?

MR. RUNCIMAN: It has been intimated to us by the Russian Government that, in view of the political situation in Russia, the presence of foreign ships in their ports might give rise to agitations and incidents connected with internal affairs, and it has therefore been decided not to proceed with the cruise as had been intended. His Majesty's Government much regret that this visit of the Fleet has to be postponed, the more so as there would be difficulties in rearranging the remaining part of the programme, and it has therefore been decided to give up the intended cruise to the Baltic altogether, including visits to other ports.

Custom House Quay.

MR. T. DAVIES (Fulham): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has been approached by the Corporation of the City of London with a view to handing over to them Custom House Quay for the purpose of utilising it in the extension of Billingsgate Market; whether he is aware of the boon this open space has been to hundreds of toilers in this congested district since the Metropolitan Public Gardens Association has been allowed to place seats and plant trees on the quay; and whether he will refuse to grant the request of the City Corporation.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): I recently received a deputation from the City Corporation and other bodies asking me to allow the quay to be used between certain hours and subject to certain conditions, to relieve the congestion which exists in connection with the Billingsgate Market. I have not yet given a reply to the request of the Corporation, and, in considering the Question, I certainly shall not fail to bear in mind the important aspect of it to which my hon. friend refers.

Metropolitan Police.

MR. ROWLANDS (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether a member of the Metropolitan constabulary, charged with being under the influence of drink while on duty, has the same privilege as a civilian in respect of claiming the opinion of a medical man as to his state and condition; and, if the privilege does not exist, will he consider the desirability of granting it?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): No alteration of existing practice in the direction indicated could be introduced without detriment to discipline.

Child Insurances.

Mr. L. HASLAM (Monmouth Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, having regard to the fact that, under the present laws affecting the insurance of the lives of children, the death of a child may, by means of insurance, be a source of profit to the person insuring, whether he will consider the advisability of introducing a Bill to provide that there shall be a limit to the amount payable on the death of a child, so that the amount payable shall not exceed such as may be reasonably required to pay for the funeral expenses of the child.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I do not know whether my hon. friend is aware that by Sections 62–67 of the Friendly Societies Act, 1896, the sum for which a child under five can be insured in one or more societies is limited to £6, and that by the Collecting Societies Act, 1896, Section 13, this limitation is extended to all Industrial Assurance Companies. Great difficulties have arisen in the way of the numerous proposals which have been made to amend the law by further reducing this limit. I would refer my hon. friend to my reply to the hon. Member for Tower Hamlets on February 22nd last,† in which I explained that the criminal law relating to this matter is already very severe, a parent who insures a child and then is guilty of cruelty or culpable neglect being liable to penal servitude for five years under Section 1, Subsection (4) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1904.

Vivisection Inquiry.

Mr. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state when the Committee, which he proposes to appoint to investigate the subject of experiments on living animals, will hold its first meeting; and of whom the Committee will consist.

Mr. GLADSTONE: A Royal Commission on this subject is about to be appointed, and the names of the Commissioners will be announced in due course when His Majesty has approved them.

Food Factory Inspection.

Mr. ARTHUR HENDERSON (Durham, Barnard Castle): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can say how many notifications of the insanitary condition of factories in which jam and other articles of food are manufactured were forwarded by the women inspectors to sanitary authorities during the period covered by the Report of the chief inspector; and whether he has authorised any Home Office inspector to act in default of the sanitary authorities, as provided for by Section 4 of the Factory Act, 1901.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I fear I cannot give the hon. Member the information asked for at such short notice, but the sanitary provisions of the Act in the case of factories are enforced by the inspectors of factories, not by the local authorities, and the number of such notices as are mentioned in the Question would be few. No case arose during 1905 in which it was found necessary to make an order under Section 4 of the Factory Act for the supersession of the local authority by the factory inspector with regard to the enforcement of the Act.

Mr. ARTHUR HENDERSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the factories in which articles of food are made, and which are alleged to be in an unsanitary condition, are premises hitherto unknown to the Home Office inspectorate, or have been subject to inspection by the male inspectors for any considerable time. I beg further to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the keeping of a factory in a cleanly state free from effluvia or other nuisance is provided for under the Factory Act, 1901, Section 1, without the intervention of the sanitary authorities; and, if so, whether steps were taken by the Home Office inspectors to remedy the defects narrated in the women's annual Report respecting jam and other food manufactories.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I have no reason for supposing that the factories referred to were unknown to the district inspectors, or have remained unvisited by them. Neglect of cleanliness at one period does not, in a trade such as this, argue previous absence of inspection. I regret to say, however, that a number of the matters to which the lady inspectors call attention, such as the cleanliness of the workers handling food materials, the cleanliness of the pots which are filled with jam, etc., are outside the scope of the Factory Act. They should, I think, be dealt with under the law for the protection of the public health, and I am bringing them to the notice of the President of the Local Government Board. The requirement of Section 1 of the Factory Act is that a factory shall be kept in a cleanly state and free from effluvia. Action was taken by the inspectors wherever the defects found were of a kind with which they had power to deal. I may add that this is by no means the first time that the inspectors have reported insanitary conditions in food preserving works, and that as the result of these reports considerable progress has been made in their sanitation, and bad places have become fewer. The whole question of the inspection of these premises is under my consideration, and I hope that still further progress will soon be made.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clii., 506.

Metropolitan Police and Sunday Duty.

MR. T. DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, having regard to the action of the French Chamber in passing almost unanimously a measure making it obligatory on all employers of labour to grant one day's rest in seven to their employees, he will reconsider the matter of granting the men of the Metropolitan Police a similar boon; and whether, if he cannot at once grant one day's rest in seven, he will consider if it is not possible to grant them one day in ten as an instalment.

MR. GLADSTONE: The Bill adopted by the French Chamber applies only to commercial and industrial employments and not to the Police. In any event the case of the English Police (who, it must be remembered, are entitled after twenty-six years' service to retire on pension and enjoy seven days rest a week) must be considered on its own merits. I have already, in reply to previous Questions, explained the difficulties, chiefly financial, which stand in the way of adopting the hon. Member's suggestions; and as regards my position in the matter I beg to refer him to the debate in the House of Commons on June 7th.†

Boy's Conviction for Begging at Gateshead.

*MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that on the evening of Friday, April 20th, 1906, a boy named Henry Maughan, aged six years, was seized by a policeman while looking into a shop window, close to his own home, taken to the police station, and charged with begging; that on the unsupported and contradicted evidence of that policeman alone he was, on May 7th, last, sentenced at the Gateshead police court to be taken from his parents and confined for ten years in an industrial school; whether he is further aware that, at the same time and on no evidence at all, the boy's father was condemned to pay a fine of 11s. and a permanent charge of 1s. 6d. a week for 10 years, and ordered to report any change of his address during that period to the police; and whether he will cause a review of the circumstances of the case to be made without delay with a view to the restitution of the child to his parents.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have made inquiry into this case, and find that this boy (whose name is William Maughan) was seen to accost seven men in the course of ten minutes; he had also been loitering in the locality nearly every evening for the previous five weeks. I am informed that the father had on two previous occasions in November last been cautioned by the Police for allowing another child to be in the streets for the purpose of begging. William Maughan was committed to an industrial school in the usual manner until sixteen, and his father was fined 5s. with costs, under the Youthful Offenders Act, and ordered to pay 1s. 6d. a week towards the cost of the child's maintenance. On the facts at present before me I do not see my way to interfere, but I propose to make further inquiries before coming to a final decision.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 601, 603.

*MR. BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentlemen inquire if this boy was convicted on the unsupported evidence of the policeman who arrested him?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, but I think the hon. Gentleman is mistaken on that point.

MR. LUPTON: Is not ten years imprisonment a very heavy sentence on a child in a case like this?

MR. GLADSTONE: It is not imprisonment.

Truck Act.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the recent decision of the King's Bench Division of the High Court in Ireland in Dean *v.* Wilson, a case which arose on a prosecution at petty sessions of a factory inspector against an employer of labour, and in which it was held that a certain weekly payment was not wages within the meaning of the Truck Acts, but was a bonus; and whether he will bring this decision under the notice of the Committee which is now inquiring into the Truck Acts.

MR. GLADSTONE: The decision in this appeal, which was taken by my instructions, has been reported to me. I am informed that it has already been brought to the notice of the Committee on the Truck Act.

Motor-'Bus Traffic.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) asked the Home Secretary whether he would consider the expediency, in the interests of public safety, which recent events had proved to be endangered, of suspending all existing licences of motor omnibuses—pending the establishment of a more rigid and effectual system of inspection than that which now obtained of the brakes and other safety appliances of such vehicles, and whether he would see that only such drivers as understood the mechanism of motors should be employed.

MR. GLADSTONE: This is a Question which requires longer notice than I have received. I am unable to accept the hon. Gentleman's main suggestion. I may say there is no evidence to prove that the recent accidents referred to are attributable to defective or unsuitable brakes or steering gear. The working condition of the brakes of all licensed vehicles is carefully and frequently inquired into by officers of the licensing authority. Any defect noticed would lead to the vehicle being forbidden to ply in the streets until it had been remedied. The question, which is both important and urgent, is one which falls within the province of the Royal Commission on Motor Cars, and the Select Committee on Cabs and Omnibuses.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in the month of June last there were 390 motor-'bus accidents in London?

MR. GLADSTONE: Yes, I gave the figures myself.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind the fact that everybody considers these 'buses a nuisance and a public danger—and that the town authorities of Kensington recently passed a resolution in which they declared that the value of property in their district had gone down because of the nuisance caused by these 'buses, and that children cannot go out into the road for a moment without danger?

MR. GLADSTONE: I am aware, and I think every hon. Member is aware, that the motor-'buses now plying on the public streets are defective in many ways, and in certain ways are distinctly a nuisance, but these points will be most carefully examined into. The whole question is a new one, and it is impossible to act in a hurry. I can assure the hon. Member that the matter is receiving the most serious attention, not only in connection with the inquiries I have already referred to, but on the part of both the police authorities and my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Do any members of the Cabinet or supporters of the Cabinet ever use these 'buses?

[No Answer was returned.]

Imprisonment of Anti-Vaccinators.

*MR. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Spencer Bray, J. J. Vann, and S. Bruin, of Blaby, in Leicestershire, were on Monday last committed to Leicester Gaol, the first two for seven days and the last for fourteen days, on orders under Section 31 of The Vaccination Act, 1867; and whether His Majesty's Government propose to take any steps to alter the law so as to make such imprisonments impossible in future.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this Question. I have no information as to the particular cases referred to; but I may point out that a parent would not be liable to any penalty under the Vaccination Acts for the non-vaccination of his child if he had obtained a certificate of conscientious objection under Section 4 of the Act of 1898. I am aware that the procedure with regard to obtaining such a certificate is not altogether satisfactory, and I am considering whether some alteration might not properly be made in the law with regard to the matter.

Pontardawe Medical Officer of Health.

MR. J. WILLIAMS (Glamorganshire, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received any notification from the Pontardawe Rural District Council of the reappointment of Dr. Griffiths Griffiths, of Pontardawe, as medical officer of health for the western division of this union; whether he has received a memorial signed by eleven members of the rural district council protesting against Dr. Griffith's reappointment for reasons stated therein; and whether he will suspend the confirmation of the appointment and make such inquiries as to the grounds upon which those reasons have been stated as are necessary in the case.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have received the notification of Dr. Griffith's reappointment and also the memorial referred to in the Question. I propose to direct an inquiry to be held before I arrive at a decision as to sanctioning the reappointment.

Alleged Ill-treatment of a Lunatic at Bramley Union.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that a man named Charles Endsor was taken from his residence, on May 11th, 1904, to the Bramley Union, Leeds, without the consent of his relatives, on the ground that he was of unsound mind, and that while in the act of escaping from the hospital ward he was caught, thrown over a wall in the grounds, and frogged across a field to the hospital, and put into the padded room, being removed two days after to the West Riding Asylum at Menston, ultimately dying there five weeks later; will he explain why there was no post mortem on the body; and, having regard to the seriousness of this and other cases of a similar character, whether he will consider the advisability of ordering a public inquiry into this matter.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am aware that allegations of the kind mentioned in the Question have been made as regards the case to which it refers. The matter was brought before the Local Government Board, who, after investigating it, came to the conclusion that there was no ground for further action on their part. It was subsequently again considered by them, but they saw no sufficient reason for altering their view. In these circumstances, and looking to the fact that the case occurred more than two years ago, I could not undertake now to reopen it.

Vaccination Prophylaxy.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, with a view to the production of more accurate statistics of vaccination prophyaxy, he will give directions for the examination of the vaccination registers in all cases of small pox to ascertain whether the patients have or have not been vaccinated.

MR. JOHN BURNS: A somewhat similar Question was put to me by my hon. friend the Member for the Sleaford division on June 14th.† For the reasons I then gave I do not feel that I could give directions of the kind suggested.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 1141.

Mr. LUPTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman direct that no statistics shall be published at all?

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: Does the right hon. Gentleman realise that the present system necessarily results in the publication of inaccurate statistics?

Mr. JOHN BURNS: I do not admit that.

Hythe Burial Ground.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been drawn to the recent decision of the Court of Appeal in Godden *v.* Hythe Burial Board, in which it was held, owing to an obvious flaw in The Burials Act, 1855, that an owner of land who chooses now to build a dwelling-house within 100 yards of a burial ground not used or appropriated prior to the date of the Act can veto interments within 100 yards range; and whether he will take the earliest suitable opportunity which presents itself to amend the law.

Mr. JOHN BURNS: My attention has been called to this matter. I certainly will give consideration to the suggestion for an amendment of the law.

Shipping Rebates.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the recommendations of the Australian Commission on shipping rebates, which are declared to be open to abuse and calculated seriously to prejudice the trade of the Commonwealth; and whether it is intended to appoint a Royal Commission to report upon the effect of such rebates upon the commerce and industry of this country, with special reference to the South African trade.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs): Yes, Sir, my attention has been called to the recommendations in question. The Government intend to appoint a Royal Commission to deal with the whole question of rebates, and the South African trade will be included in the scope of the inquiry.

School Age.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been called to the fact that compulsory education begins at a lower age in England than in any other civilised country; and whether he will consider the desirability, either of amending the existing Law or of recommending to local education authorities that no parent should be prosecuted for keeping his child away from school until the child has attained seven years of age.

The PRESIDENT to the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): I have perused the White Paper recently issued by the Board of Education on this subject. I am not prepared to attempt any legislation on the matter of school attendance for the present at all events. As regards the concluding paragraph of the Question, the authorities have a wide discretion, and I do not think it is desirable, while the Law is as it is to put any pressure upon them in the direction suggested.

Luton School Libel Case.

Mr. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if his attention has been called to the case of E. W. Lemmon, who is being prosecuted for libel in connection with statements made in reference to the alleged flogging of children at Luton School, Chatham, a non-provided school; and if he will order an inquiry into the whole circumstances.

Mr. BIRRELL: My attention has only been called to the case through the hon. Member's Question. So far as the information in the Board's possession enables me to judge, it would seem that after a preliminary hearing of the case on March 22nd the defendant was bound over to stand his trial at the next Assizes. I have no later information than this, but will endeavour to find out what has happened. It would not be proper or expedient for me to take any action while the case is *sub judice.*

West Riding (Yorkshire) Teachers' Salaries.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in view of the fact that the West Riding

County Council have decided to appeal against the recent decision of the Court of King's Bench as to the payment of teachers' salaries, he can now consent so to amend Clause 10, Sub-section (2), of the Education Bill as to secure the full payment of teachers' salaries by the local education authority in the transition schools created under that clause.

MR. BIRRELL: I have no information as to the alleged intention of the County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire, and I see no connection between any appeal they may think fit to lodge against the unanimous decision of the Court of King's Bench and the sub-section of the clause referred to by the hon. Member.

MR. LANE-FOX: In the event of the West Riding County Council deciding not to appeal will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to secure payment of the arrears of the teachers' salaries, seeing that they are poor men in many cases?

MR. BIRRELL: My sympathies are entirely with the teachers. I will do the best I can.

Vaccination of Pupil Teachers.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the proviso in the regulations for the instruction and training of pupil teachers, which comes into force on August 1st next, that candidates must be vaccinated except when a parent or guardian has declared a conscientious objection means that a magistrate must have granted a certificate, or that such objection may be declared to the local education authorities irrespective of any action that a magistrate may have seen fit to take.

MR. BIRRELL: The Board will not require for the purpose of its registration any declaration before a magistrate, but will be satisfied with a declaration signed by the candidate, or when a minor by his parent or guardian, to be countersigned by the local authority's representative and one other responsible person.

Education Appeals.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, where extended facilities are demanded under Clause 4 of the Education Bill and are refused, an appeal to the Board of Education would lie in the case of a school about to be transferred under the Act, a school actually transferred and desiring these facilities, or a school coming into existence after the Bill is passed.

MR. BIRRELL: I am not sure what the noble Lord means by the phrase "about to be transferred," but there is an appeal on the part of the owners of an existing voluntary school, fulfilling the various conditions of Clause 4, against the refusal of a local authority to agree to a transfer of the schools; and if the Board make an order requiring the transfer of the school to be taken by the authority, the giving of extended facilities under Clause 4 may also be ordered as part of the arrangement thus made by the Boad upon the appeal. As regards (2) and (3) there is no appeal.

Irish Ordnance Survey—Map Printing.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he can say why the printing of maps six inches to the mile is being carried out at Southampton instead of Dublin, in view of the fact that the work is purely Irish; whether printers were discharged in 1905 from the Ordnance Survey, Dublin, and, if so, how many; if he can state the number of employees under notice of discharge at the Dublin Survey Office; and whether it is intended to abolish the Irish Survey as a productive department, and thereby transfer all the work of production to Southampton.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): As a temporary measure some of the six-inch maps of Ireland are being printed at Southampton, as the printing staff in Ireland is at present fully occupied with urgent work for the Land Judge's Court. One printer was discharged in 1905 owing to the increased output of the motor driven presses, which were introduced in that year. Two young men are under notice of discharge as there is no opportunity for their further advancement and it is not in their own interest to keep them on at boys' duties. There is no intention of transferring all the producing work to Southampton. I may add that the proportion of the total cost of the Survey which is expended in Ireland has risen from 33 per cent. to 43 per cent. in the last five years.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: If the printing staff in Dublin is fully occupied how is it there have been recent discharges from that Department?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY asked for notice.

Pensions of Scottish Asylum Officials.

MR. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he intends taking any steps to carry out the suggestion of the Commissioners of Lunacy in Scotland, in their last Report, that officers and servants of district asylums in Scotland should be placed in the same position, as regards pensions, as officers and servants in county and borough asylums in England.

SIR J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire): I beg also to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he will be able during this session to take the requisite measures to place the officers and servants of the Melrose Lunatic Asylum, and other similar institutions, in the same position as regards superannuation allowances as these employed in England and Ireland.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): I regret that I have no alternative but to repeat the Answer given to my hon. friend the Member for Roxburghshire, on 9th April last,† to the effect that I am unable to introduce a Bill conferring the necessary powers this session.

Barlinnie Prison, Glasgow.

MR. WATT (Glasgow College): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, whether he is aware that the maximum number of prisoners for whom accommodation is provided in Barlinnie Prison, Glasgow, is 1,034; that on July 3rd there were no fewer than 1,100 prisoners in that prison, some of whom had been sent there to serve sentences for overcrowding, and that a number or them were placed together, three in a cell, of less than 1,000 feet capacity; and will he say how this accommodation compares with the minimum air space per adult insisted on by the Glasgow Corporation in the worst class of ticketed houses.

MR. SINCLAIR: The accommodation at Barlinnie is very slightly above the number given by the hon. Member, and a few of the cells have a cubic capacity of 1,784 feet. The situation referred to existed for one night, and fifty prisoners were transferred to Perth on the following day. I am aware that there is a deficiency of prison accommodation in the Glasgow district of the country, and steps are being taken to increase it. In the meantime transfer of prisoners are made as quickly as can be arranged. Already during the present month 150 prisoners have been moved from Barlinnie prison. I have not been able to ascertain the regulations of the Glasgow Corporation about ticketed houses.

Glenties Union—Clerk's Salary.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that at Glenties, county Donegal, on the 7th instant, 500 people, many of them carrying sticks, assembled at the workhouse and intimidated the guardians into rescinding a resolution passed a month ago voting an increase of salary to the clerk of the union; whether the Local Government Board has sanctioned this increase; and what steps they propose to take in the matter.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BRYCE, Aberdeen, S.): An increase of salary of £20 a year was voted by the Glenties Board of Guardians to the clerk of the Glenties Union on June 5th, and a letter notifying the sanction of the Local Government Board was issued on June 22nd. A deputation of ratepayers attended at the guardians' meeting on the 7th instant to protest against the increase, but it does not appear from the guardians' minutes that any proposal was made to rescind the resolution granting the increase. No necessity, therefore, has arisen for the Local Government Board to take any steps in the matter. I am informed by the police authorities that it is the fact that a large number of ratepayers accompanied the deputation referred to, but their deameanour was quiet and orderly, and no intimidation was used.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clv., 1002.

District Inspector Wade, Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.) On behalf of the hon. Member for East Wicklow, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether District Inspector Wade, who has recently been transferred from Queenstown to Wicklow, has for the past three years drawn an annual allowance for the wages of a manservant; if so, whether he kept a manservant; during the whole of that time, or did one of the police constables act as servant for him; if so, was the constable paid for such work; and if this is contrary to the regulations.

MR. BRYCE: The reply to the first inquiry is in the affirmative. The Inspector-General informs me that on three occasions during the period mentioned the district inspector was suddenly left without a groom, whereupon three constables voluntarily fed and watered his horse for a few days until he got a groom. When the matter was brought to the Inspector-General's notice in January last he informed the district inspector that, while he fully appreciated the good feeling shown by the constables, the better course would have been to send the horse to a livery stable. The constables were not paid for the work. There is no regulation bearing on this subject.

Estates Commissioners: Correspondence.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that a landlord is frequently allowed to read and profit by correspondence between his tenants and the Estates Commissioners with reference to a proposed sale; will the Commissioners allow tenants, evicted tenants, or other persons having rights under the Land Act of 1903, or their legal or parliamentary representative, to read a landlord's letter affecting them; and, for example, will they allow a reading of Colonel Smythe's letter, refusing to sell, for the use of the evicted families, two evicted farms though untenanted

MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they exercise their discretion in each particular case as to the use they make of correspondence which they may receive from landlord or tenant or otherwise. That discretion is not exercised in such a way as to give advantage to either party. The Commissioners do not consider that any good purpose would be served by communicating the reasons stated by Colonel Smythe for not selling the lands referred to in the Question.

Ballinamore Eviction.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the eviction of Patrick McLoughlin by Mr. James Birney from his shop and premises in Ballinamore on June 25th; will he say whether the sheriff was assisted by police on the occasion, and, if so, how many; did the police actually search the various rooms and out offices; is this bailiff's work done by the police with the knowledge or authority of the Government, and was it part of their duty to re-search the premises after the sheriff had departed, having given possession to Mr. Birney; will he say whether, late in the evening of the same day, a gentleman, who had been on the premises during the whole proceedings, walked out by the front door, and can the police explain how this oversight occurred; and will possession be re-given by the sheriff.

MR. BRYCE: I am informed by the police authorities that on the occasion mentioned two policemen, namely, a head constable and a sergeant, accompanied the sub-sheriff at his request for the purpose of protecting him in the execution of the writ of ejectment. The police did not themselves search the premises, but they accompanied the sub-sheriff while he was doing so. It is the duty of the police to afford full protection to the sheriff. After the eviction the sergeant remained at the door of the premises until a crowd had dispersed, and while there a man who had been unobserved by the sheriff came out of the House. The question whether legal possession was given up to the plaintiff by the sheriff is not one in which the police are concerned.

Irish Emigration.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has seen the Return of Emigrants, natives of

Ireland, for the month of June, 1906, and the six months ending 30th June, 1906, showing respectively that 2,567 and 21,612 emigrants left the ports of Ireland; can he say how many of these men, women, and children have left their native country never to return; and is he aware of any other country similarly circumstanced whose people leave her shores in such numbers in proportion to population and birth rate; and will this matter, in view of the oft expressed inability of the Government to deal with it, be submitted in any form to the Colonial Conference to sit in 1907.

*MR. BRYCE: The figures are as stated in the first part of the Question. The emigrants included in these Returns consist of persons who are understood to be leaving the country with the intention of permanently settling elsewhere. The rate of emigration from Ireland, though still regrettably high, has of late years shown a slight tendency to decrease. During the past ten years the average annual rate of emigration was 8·5 per 1,000 of the population; last year it was 7·0 per 1,000. There is every reason to hope that emigration will be checked still further by ameliorative measures for the relief of congestion and otherwise. I do not think the matter is one which could with advantage be submitted to a Colonial Conference. The percentage of emigration from Ireland to the colonies is small.

Bann Drainage.

MR. LONSDALE: On behalf of the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can give any information with regard to the Bann drainage.

*MR. BRYCE: The Irish Government have thought it desirable to obtain the views upon Sir Alexander Binnie's scheme of a number of authorities and persons locally interested. Replies have been received from the majority of these, and are now under consideration. A valuation of the lands which would be beneficially affected by a drainage scheme has also been ordered. A number of details require consideration before action can be taken. The matter will continue to engage the close attention of the Government, who are fully sensible of its importance.

Mr. Patrick Haire's Valuations.

MR. HOGAN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that Mr. Patrick Haire valued land in connection with the Labourers (Ireland) Acts in the Borrisokane Union, in the county of Tipperary, and made awards on seven labourers' plots exceeding all previous awards in that union, ranging from thirty-two to thirty-eight years' purchase; for three statute acres he awarded £98, for one statute acre £30 15s., and for one rood and thirty-five perches £18 15s.; whether, considering that the highest rent that was paid for any of this land was £1 per Irish acre, he will say on what ground such an award was made; what are the qualifications of Mr. Haire as a land valuer; and who appointed him to the office.

MR. HOGAN: I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Patrick Haire, arbitrator of the Local Government Board, when making awards as to the value of the plots of land in the Borrisokane Union in connection with the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, called for no sworn evidence in connection with the same, and for the two days he was engaged valuing the plots his expenses were £15 15s.; whether, as dissatisfaction exists amongst the ratepayers with regard to his valuation of the plots and the amount of his expenses, he will take steps to see that an arbitrator with a greater knowledge of land revalues these plots; and whether he will say in what way his expenses were made up, and whether they were sanctioned by the Local Government Board.

*MR. BRYCE: I am informed that Mr. Robert Haire recently valued land required for the purposes of the Labourers Acts in the Borrisokane Union, but it is incorrect to say that his awards on seven plots ranged from thirty-two to thirty-eight years' purchase. It would not be possible within the limits of an Answer to deal in detail with Mr. Haire's different awards and the reasons for them, but I will forward to the hon. Member the observations of the Local Government

Board in the matter. Mr. Haire is a Member of the Institute of Civil Engineers, England, and served for a considerable period under the Commissioners of public works. He has had much experience as an arbitrator and has acted in that capacity under the Labourers Acts on several occasions since 1898, and has discharged the duties in a satisfactory manner. He was selected for the post by the Local Government Board. It is the fact that Mr. Haire did not deem it necessary to examine the parties on oath. His fee is the usual one of £3 3s. a day, and the time occupied by his inspections inquiry, correspondence, and making the award in duplicate, was four and one-third days. His expenses in all amounted to £18 11s., of which his fee was £13 13s., and the balance was travelling and other expenses. The arbitrator's account has not yet been passed by the Local Government Board. There is no power to direct a re-valuation.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): Is this valuer a permanent official?

*MR. BRYCE: I rather gather not.

Cavan County Evicted Tenants.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state how many inspectors have visited county Cavan from the Estates and Land Commission with a view of bringing about the restoration of the evicted tenants in that county; how many cases have been dealt with for the six months ending 30th June 1906; how many evicted tenants have been restored to their old homes and how many have been supplied with new farms; and can he say in how many cases the evicted farms are on the landlords' hands.

*MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners inform me that two of their inspectors have visited county Cavan for the purpose of making inquiries as to evicted tenants. Twenty-two applications have been referred to these inspectors for inquiry within the last six months, and are being dealt with by them. The Commissioners have received information that nineteen evicted tenants have been reinstated in this county since the passing of the Act; eighteen of these appear to have been restored to their former holdings and one placed in another holding. According to the applications which have been received, fifty-two evicted holdings in this county are in the landlords' hands.

Irish Experimental Farms.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, as representing the Department of Agriculture, whether reports and statements of accounts showing the profit or loss in connection with their experimental farms in county Cork and elsewhere were published by the Department; and, if not, whether he will furnish hon. Members of this House with copies of such accounts.

*MR. BRYCE: The Department of Agriculture do not keep accounts showing the profit and loss in connection with their experimental farms. These farms are not conducted upon ordinary commercial lines. They were established for the education and training in educational work of the pupils who attend for instruction.

MR. LUNDON: As this Department is supported out of Irish funds they ought to keep proper accounts.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, as representing the Department of Agriculture, whether the Department, before commencing to subsidise the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, received any statements of how this society proposed to expend the money; and, in view of the fact that the Department has continued to subsidise this society for a considerable time, whether he will state if Reports or Statements have been furnished to the Department of how the money granted was spent; and whether copies of all such Reports will be laid upon the Table of the House.

*MR. BRYCE: I beg to refer to the full replies which I gave to Questions on this subject put by the hon. Member for East Mayo on May 21st† and 29th.‡ No subsidies were granted by the Department to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society prior to February, 1905. Payments made to the society before that date were recoupments in respect of work already done for the Department. The grant of £2,000 for the year ending February 28th, 1906 was decided upon in respect of certain specific work of organisation to be done for the Department, the particulars of which were embodied in a scheme; and, as already stated, this sum was paid in monthly instalments, upon the certificate of the Department's representative that the work in question had been done. A similar course has been taken in respect of the grant of £3,700 for the current year. The Answer to the concluding part of the Question is in the negative.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clvii., 902.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clviii., 257.

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (on behalf of the hon. Member for East Wicklow): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he intends to proceed any further with the Lunacy (Ireland) Bill during this part of the session; and, if so, when he proposes to move its Second Reading.

*MR. BRYCE: It is intended to proceed with this Bill, but I cannot yet say when an opportunity for moving the Second Reading will arise.

Coolkill Evicted Tenant.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will say if an application for reinstatement has been received by the Estates Commissioners from Mrs. Mary Coyle, whose husband, Hugh Coyle, deceased, was evicted from his farm in Toneylion and Coolkill, for non-payment of rent, by his landlord, Mr. John Fay, of Moynehall, county Cavan, in 1886; will he say whether this evicted farm is in the landlord's hands since; and what steps the Commissioners are taking to restore the evicted tenant to her old home.

*MR. BRYCE: The Estates Commissioners have received from Mrs. Coyle an application for reinstatement in her former holding which is stated to be in the landlord's hands. The application has been referred to an inspector for inquiry.

Irish Railway Inquiry.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has now decided upon the form which the proposed inquiry into Irish railways is to take; and whether he has considered the advisability of referring the consideration of the Irish canal system to this body, rather than to the Commission already appointed by the Board of Trade, in order that the question of transit in Ireland may be dealt with as a whole.

MR. BRYCE: The terms of reference to the Commission on Irish railways have already been published and the hon. Member has probably seen them. The question of referring the consideration of the Irish canal system to this Commission was fully considered, and although there might have been some advantages in taking the course suggested in the Question, the balance of arguments was distinctly in favour of allowing the canal inquiry already instituted to proceed, and committing the railway inquiry to a separate specially qualified body.

MR. HUGH LAW: Will the Railway Commission have an opportunity of considering the whole question in its relation to canals?

MR. BRYCE: Yes, Sir.

Tinahely Post Office—Medical Officer.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if Dr. John Bolster, ex-medical officer of the Tinahely, county Wicklow, district, has been appointed medical attendant to the officials at the Post Office, Tinahely; whether he is aware that Dr. Bolster was charged with gross neglect of duty by the board of guardians; that two official inquiries were held by a Local Government Board inspector into the charges made by the guardians; that, as the result of these inquiries, Dr. Bolster resigned his position as medical officer of the Tinahely district; that Dr. Bolster was dismissed by the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway from his position as medical attendant upon the employees of that company; and whether he has sanctioned, or intends to sanction, the appointment of Dr. Bolster as medical officer of the Tinahely Post Office employees.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): Dr. John Bolster, medical officer to the Post Office Officials at Tinahely, was appointed early in the year. I had then no knowledge of the circumstances referred to by the hon. Member; but I am inquiring into the matter.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Will the right hon. Gentleman address his inquiries to the Board of Guardians in whose employment this doctor was for some years?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Naturally they are the people of whom to inquire.

Responsible Government for South African Colonies.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether there are any precedents for the grant of responsible government to a Colony by Letters Patent; if there are any precedents for such a procedure for such an object, what opportunities were then given to Parliament for discussion; and at what stage of the question; if there are no precedents, what opportunities does His Majesty's Government propose to afford to Parliament for the consideration of so important a change.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): The nearest precedent is that of Newfoundland, particulars of which will be found in Return 142 of 1905. In that case the only discussion in this House took place on March 20th, 1855, on the Motion for adjournment. The Letters Patent cannot be discussed in detail until they are laid on the Table of the House; and they cannot be so laid before the House re-assembles in October. But His Majesty's Government anticipate that they will be in a position to make a statement on the subject of the Constitution before the House rises.

MR. LYTTELTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman give a pledge that the principle of these matters shall be discussed on the Colonial Vote?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is what I refer to; that is the occasion on which I hope we shall be in a position to make a statement.

MR. LYTTELTON: The right hon. Gentleman does not appear to appreciate my Question. I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say it is anticipated that that will be the case; the Question I ask him is whether he will give a positive pledge that such will be the case.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir, I decline to give any pledge. I have no doubt in my own mind that it will be so, but I cannot pledge myself because I do not know. We have not yet received the Report of the Committee; it will not be in our hands till the end of this week. Altogether, it is possible; I hope that no unseen impediment will arise, but I cannot pledge myself.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) Are we to understand that the Letters Patent will not be issued until the sitting of Parliament in October?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, they will be issued when they are ready.

MR. LYTTELTON: Are we to understand that the grant and the terms of this Constitution to the Transvaal and Orange River Colony may be irrevocable before any discussion has taken place in this House?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN No, not at all. That is to say, I trust that a statement, as I have said, of the principles on which the Letters Patent will be founded will be made before the House rises, and then the House will have an opportunity of expressing its opinion.

Imperial Preference—Resolution of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been directed to the resolution in favour of a system of Imperial preference which was passed, by a majority of three to one, at the meeting of the Congress of Chambers of Commerce of the Empire on Wednesday last; and whether, in the event of this question being brought before the Colonial Conference of next year, the representatives of the Government will be permitted to consider it with an open mind.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The views of the Government upon this matter have been frequently stated, are well-known, and are not likely to change. Of course any proposals that may be put forward by the representatives of the Colonies at the Conference will receive respectful consideration.

Weights and Measures and Currency.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the resolution passed unanimously by the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire at their recent congress, recommending that a Royal Commission should be appointed by His Majesty's Government to investigate and, if possible, recommend uniform systems of weights and measures and currency to be adopted throughout the British Empire; and whether His Majesty's Government will take action in accordance with this recommendation.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: His Majesty's Government have not had time to consider the evidence on which the Chambers of Commerce adopted the resolution referred to, and they are not prepared at present to make any statement on the subject.

Parliamentary Speeches.

SIR CARNE RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that three hon. Members spoke continuously for four hours and thirty-five minutes on Thursday, leaving two hours and twenty-five minutes for 666 Members; and if he will consider the circumstance in framing his Rules of Procedure.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think we cannot complete a new scheme of Rules of Procedure without dealing with the question of the length of speeches. But an hon. Member may take more than his share of the time of the House quite as well by frequent speeches as by long speeches, and I hope the hon. and gallant Member does not mean to imply, although his Question might be read in that sense, that the rules should provide for all the 670 Members speaking on the same subject.

TREATMENT OF ZULU WOUNDED.

*MR. LEHMANN: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can give the House any official information which will relieve the anxiety caused by reports of the refusal of quarter to the Zulus in the operations in Natal, and their slaughter by native levies.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have been greatly shocked, as everyone must have been, by this report, which I have only heard of. I have not seen it myself, as the paper in which it appeared is not one which I habitually study. We have no official information on the subject at all, but I sincerely hope that there is no foundation for the rumour—and I should not be much surprised to learn there is not. At any rate, I feel it necessary to say that if there is any foundation for it, it is a most grave and serious matter, requiring the closest and most earnest attention of the Government.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): May I ask whether the attention of the right hon. Gentleman has been directed to a report in nearly all the newspapers to the effect that the head of the late chief, Bambata, was severed from the body and was publicly exposed for two days by order, and whether, if the report of this occurrence should prove to be true, he will take steps to see that such shocking barbarity is not in future permitted?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have not seen that report. I have nothing but horror for the event, if it has taken place.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Are we to understand from the right hon. Gentleman's Answers that the Government are going to make telegraphic inquiries as to the truth of the reports?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We have already done so.

NEW BILLS.

DEANERY OF MANCHESTER BILL.

"To make further provision with respect to the Revenues of the Deanery of Manchester," presented by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 309.]

ECCLESIASTICAL DISORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

"To provide for the better enforcement of the Laws relating to public worship and to deal with Ecclesiastical Disorders in the Church of England," presented by Sir George Kekewich; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 310.]

EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 35:—

SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan), in moving the omission of subsection (*a*), said that while as a matter of fact he did not wish the subsection to be omitted, he did desire to raise this question of the use of the school buildings during holidays. The point was not so much what was desirable but what was possible of accomplishment as a matter of administration. The midsummer holiday would be mainly affected by this provision, and it was desirable that in that period the schools should be closed for the purpose of cleaning. He was not quite sure it would be in the interests of education to use them as suggested. He was greatly struck by a remark made by Archbishop Temple in the summer before his lamented death. When distributing prizes at his old school at Tiverton he advised the boys to shut up their books during the whole summer holidays and to spend their time in seeing as much as they could and in observing objects around them. Such advice was equally good for children and teachers; all school children required recreation and change in the mode of thought; so too did the teachers, and he was once told by a very experienced teacher that it was good neither for masters nor boys for them to be always together. Those who were engaged on the Committee which considered the question of feeding the children had had before them the question of the attendance of the masters during the times the children were supplied with food, and they thought the willingness of the masters to undertake the task was not a sufficient justification for exacting that duty from them. They discouraged it on the ground of health and the usefulness of the school. If that was true with regard to the meal hours in the school, there was also some truth in it as regarded other occupations during the holidays. Another thing of great importance was that the masters should have some time that they could really call their own. They required recreation and amusement almost as much as Members of Parliament, and as an old Member he might be permitted to say they deserved it quite as much. The constant pressure and striving was, he was sure, injurious to the teachers from the point of view of health, and in other regards inasmuch as it prevented them acquiring information. When detained in school day by day and week by week they had no opportunity of acquiring information beyond the school and the district, which it was important that teachers should possess. Their inclinations should be made more wide and their opportunities to acquire knowledge of the world around them more extensive. He therefore thought it was injurious to the teachers to have this new task imposed upon them. There was also a domestic reason. They should not be deprived of their family life. They should not be prevented from seeking with their families recreation and the means of gaining health as they would be if detained within the bounds of the school. He thought these reasons were of sufficient importance to weigh with the Committee in their dealing with this matter. He presumed the intention of the Government in introducing the clause was that there should be some provision either by by-law or by other means for the securing of good order. During the holidays there was a period of freedom and sometimes of neglect. It appeared to him that if the clause became part of the Act there ought to be some provision to compel good order without mischief arising. There were, no doubt, more opportunities given in these classes for extended visits on the part of the children and for their gaining wider information, and on that ground he welcomed the clause, provided it was properly self-guarded. Another point that ought to be borne in mind was that of parental responsibility. Parents ought to feel their responsibilities for the children during the holidays, and he believed the country would lose rather than gain if in a provision of this kind they weakened that responsibility which was as important to the parent as to the child and which was certainly of enormous value in building up society and producing that sympathy and loving kindness which ought to exist between parent and child. He did not care at the moment to make suggestions as to the nature of the teaching to be given in these classes. His reason for rising was really to ask for further information on the subject. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 3, to leave out subsection '(*a*).'"—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That subsection (*a*), down to the words 'holidays; and,' stand part of the clause."

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) supported the Amendment not so much because he objected to the subsection as that he objected to the vagueness of the terms in which it was drawn. He thought the criticism of the Education Committee of the Lancashire County Council was very much to the point. They said that the powers given under this clause appeared to be very wide and should be more closely defined. That, he thought, was a fair and honest statement. He did not quarrel with the powers given under subsection "(*a*)," but with the fact that in that subsection the same power was not given to the Board of Education as was given in subsection "(*b*)." With regard to the provision for recreation in the schoolhouses during the holidays, the children would, he thought, much prefer the power of recreation in the school-yards, but he might be told that that was included in the term "schoolhouses." If the provision meant that the local education authorities should have the power of providing the children with football or cricket in the playgrounds during the holidays, he heartily supported the clause as being one that would keep the children out of the streets and take care of them generally. But how much further did the clause go, because it was very widely drawn? As he read the new Clause 26 all the powers of Clause 35 could be handed over by the local education authority to a minor education authority, and although no doubt the majority of such authorities would use their powers well and with credit to themselves and the local education authority, yet there might be some whose hearts were stronger than their heads, who might go beyond what was intended by the clause. When school boards were first started everybody agreed that the rate would never exceed threepence ["No]." That he believed was the general impression. Now in many cases the rate went into shillings, and he thought they ought to have some statement as to how far these powers were to go. He agreed that the attendance at the vacation schools was voluntary for both teachers and children, but the Committee ought to know what was to be permitted to be taught. So far as he could see there was no limit. There was nothing in the clause to prevent even the teaching of denominational religion in the vacation schools at the public expense. The teachers also, he presumed, would be the ordinary teachers of the school, both for the sake of economy, and because they knew the children, and because the local education authority knew them to be well qualified to give the instruction. They were not under the clause compelled to give the instruction, but as the Parliamentary Secretary stated the other day in another connection, although they could not be compelled to give it, they could be discharged if they did not. He thought the Committee was entitled to some further explanation with regard to this important matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.) said he was glad to find there was no real opposition either from the hon. Baronet who moved, or the hon. Gentleman who supported the Amendment. All they desired was that the clause should express in a more precise form the limitations and the character of the vacation schools, and the teaching that could be afforded. He was not in a position, and he hoped he never would be called upon, to make a syllabus of games, but there was an evident desire on the part of many local authorities and of a great many people deeply interested in education in our large towns to organise games, and he need not say that he himself attached great importance to the movement. It might be that the children of the well-to-do classes in our public schools had of late years attached too much importance to athleticism. But because they got too much, it was no reason why the children of the poorer classes should get none; and the idea that children could be turned out to play games without any instruction or organisation was absurd. There was a great desire that children should be instructed in the ethics of the playground; but it would not be wise to attempt any exact definition of what was to be done. The children were there, and the desire to play was born with them. All that was required was that they should have the opportunity and the necessary amount of instruction in the rules which were so essential if games were to be carried on in the proper spirit and the children were to learn the invaluable lessons of organised play. Though the language of the clause was purposely wide, there was no reason to anticipate any such evil consequences as an attempt on the part of the local authorities to use these schools for purposes outside their proper scope. The term "school-house" included the playground. It was melancholy to see these playgrounds standing empty when they might be filled with playing children. Those who asked what was meant by a vacation school had better go and see one, such as that in which Mrs. Humphry Ward had interested herself. The visitor would be struck by the amazing cleverness of the children—the marvellous ability they displayed for all kinds of exercises demanding manual dexterity, and the readiness with which they learnt to do these things together. They were taught to draw and to dance—one of the most pleasing of social accomplishments. If he were asked what the London ratepayers had got for their money, he would point to the acquirement by children of the charming and graceful accomplishment of dancing—even if it were only round a barrel organ. In these schools children were taught weaving, basket-making, modelling and drawing, and even tiny children learnt to play nursery games with an enthusiasm and an affection one for the other which was most remarkable. Such occupations played a useful part in the education of the children, and fitted them for graver pursuits, besides enabling them to enjoy some of the gaiety of childhood. There was no necessity to enter into a detailed statement as to what was to be done. It would have to be done cautiously, and there was no danger of local authorities plunging into extravagance. In the interests of the children and of the country, the Committee might pass this provision with satisfaction, and in the hope that the powers might be more largely taken advantage of.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University) said that he, and he thought the Committee generally, sympathised with what the right hon. Gentleman had said. In the large towns there could be no doubt the elementary school holiday was not so much a holiday as it was in country schools or in the better classes of life. The children often missed during vacation the airy and comfortable schoolroom and the playground. Anyone who had seen a vacation school in a large town must be alive to the fact that it was a great boon to the children who attended it. He entirely agreed with the President of the Board of Education that it wanted a little instruction in order to play a game with satisfaction to all concerned, and that games under some sort of supervision were much happier and wholesome than those without any. All he would suggest was that the clause needed something more in the nature of definition. Was it equally applicable to the town and the country? He should have thought that children in the country were really better left to their own resources. They were dealing with a great number of schools to be transferred from owners or trustees to local education authorities, and under these circumstances he thought the consent of the owners or trustees should be asked, though he had no doubt it would be willingly given. Then, again, they had to bear in mind that the Minister for Education contemplated a very large measure of delegation, but were the minor authorities to have power to spend the ratepayers' money on vacation schools, possibly without sufficient inquiry beforehand as to whether they would be fully used and properly carried into effect? On all these points they needed something in the nature of definition, and, above all, that a local authority desiring to provide vacation schools should have to refer to the Board of Education for formal permission, so that there might be proper inquiry to see that the owners or trustees did not suffer under a hardship or that the ratepayers' money was not misspent.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) said it was refreshing to hear the Minister for Education express the hope that some of the time, thought, and care expended on the playtime of the rich might also be spent on the playtime of the poor, and from that point of view he felt himself in very cordial sympathy with this clause. It was a question in which a good deal of practical experience had already been obtained, if not in this country, at least in America. The vacation school had been started there at first as a voluntary movement, but it was found that if it was to be carried on in a useful and permanent form it must be done under public control and by public funds. In New York he believed that over 80,000 children attended such vacation schools. In Chicago, after having been carried on for five years on the voluntary principle, the system had now become a matter of State interest and administration. In London experiments had been made at the Passmore Edwards Settlement for four years. In 1902 the numbers attending were 600; last year they had increased to between 1,100 and 1,200. These boys and girls, but for the vacation classes, would have been simply thrown upon the streets. The cost of the experiment was small compared with the value of the result, the sum expended in 1905 being £270, of which by far the larger part went to the payment of teachers. It was in providing the teachers that the crux of the problem lay. They must not encroach upon the holidays of the regular staff of teachers, because of all people in the world teachers needed rest and recreation. This difficulty, however, ought not to interfere with the carrying out of the experiment; and various suggestions had been made to meet it. If the principle of the vacation school were applied to the whole of London it would be a very large affair. It was estimated that some 600,000 children would have to be provided for, distributed over 300 schools, and the cost would be about £60,000 a year. That would be a heavy charge upon the rates, but he was inclined to think that the experiment might proceed gradually and the local authorities might be trusted to see whether starting from small and cautious beginnings, they could not organise it on a larger and more general scale. The chief work hitherto done at the Passmore Edwards Settlement with the elder boys was woodwork and with the elder girls cookery. In Chicago the programme in future was limited to manual training for boys and various domestic arts for girls, with physical culture and science for all.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) understood that this clause gave power to local education authorities to carry out many objects which he thought were desirable, but he would like to know what its effect would be upon previous sections in regard to transfers. Probably the right hon. Gentleman was right in saying that in matters of this kind it was unwise to attempt any definition or bother about details. That was the attitude taken on Clause 26, and that had since been dropped. He wished to know if the local authorities could go to the trustees or owners, and say "We want your school for the whole of the vacation and the evenings and the whole of Saturdays." They had been told that the existing voluntary schools would only be required from 9 to 4, excluding Saturdays and Sundays. Supposing the trustee or owner did not come to an agreement, was it within the purview of the local education authority to take the matter before the Commission under Clause 8? Could this point be made a condition of the arrangement under Clause 2, and would the Commissioners under Clause 8 be able to deal with the matter? If that view was correct he presumed it would exclude agreements from the initial stages of the transfer. Clause 4 as amended provided that "no rent or payment can be made." Would that exclude any rent or payment for the use of the transferred schoolhouse on Saturdays, Sundays, or during vacations?

MR. BIRRELL thought the noble Lord was under some misapprehension as to the effect of the clause. It had nothing whatever to do with the bargain which the local authorities might strike with the trustees for the use of the schools for the purposes of elementary education. They might come to any bargain they liked, but there was nothing in this clause which required them to do any more than come to terms for the purposes of public elementary education, and no more burdens would be placed upon them than were already provided for in the Bill. The noble Lord might rely upon it that the trustees would not be ousted from the use of their schools. In many transferred schools these provisions would never come into operation at all. Except by agreement there was nothing in the clause that could impose upon owners or trustees any greater obligation than would be the case if it was not in the Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said he did not see, after reading the clause, what the limited power was. They were not divided upon any point of policy, but it seemed to him that the local education authority would have power in vacation time to do what they pleased with the buildings now used as voluntary schools, and to use them on all days of the week and all hours of the day. That view might be wrong, but it seemed to him to be the natural interpretation.

MR. BIRRELL did not think that view was right, but he would undertake to look into the matter.

SIR FRANCIS POWELL asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR moved to insert in line 4 after the word "classes," the words "in other than bookwork." His view of these classes was that they should be for play, or something near to it, namely, interesting manual instruction. He was a great believer in the educational value of games, and he was certain that games were more educational than a great many other things that were taught at considerable expense. He knew that his opinion was not universally held. He was convinced that unless they put in some limiting words the word "classes" taken by itself would suggest to a large number of people, not always the most highly educated, that what was wanted was to have a holiday task imposed, which was an abominable practice.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 4, after the word 'classes' to insert the words 'in other than book work.'"—*(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)*

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said he entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman as to the purpose in view. But the words he had suggested might prevent a child's reading "Hans Andersen's Fairy Tales," or little manuals to which reference might have to be made. He was aware what book work meant and he was a little frightened of it. Book work in university circles might have a technical meaning. He did not like absolutely to bar out books, but he would consider whether he could not introduce words which would carry out the laudable desire of the right hon. Gentleman and also his own, so that the clause might not be made to seem to impose a burden on the sometimes overburdened brains of the children.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would not press the Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON suggested that what was proposed might be met by the omission of the word "classes" in sub-section (a). There were many delicate children in whose case it was not desirable to impose book work which might take the form of a holiday task.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) suggested that the children might be taught shooting during the vacation.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said that a great poet had spoken of the

"Delightful task! to rear the tender thought,
To teach the young idea how to shoot."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) moved an Amendment to enable the local education authority to provide "play centres" for children out of school hours during term time. The clause as it stood gave the local education authority power to organise vacation schools, and means of recreation in the schoolhouses during the holidays, and what he now proposed was that they should be permitted to organise play centres in different parts of the great cities to which the children could go in the evenings after school hours. The main reason why he thought the Committee ought to encourage the organising of play centres during term time was in order to deal to some extent with one of the worst evils of slum life in our great cities. To enable hon. Members to make up their minds whether these centres would be of value, he would read what was said by Mrs. Humphrey Ward of one which was established in the district of Walworth—

> "The Warden of the Browning Settlement reports of Walworth; 'In this crowded district, the only playgrounds for the children after dark are the streets; and the damp and cold stairs and corridors of the tenement blocks, where they sit and play on the hard stone. The homes are as a rule much too small and crowded to allow any room for child sports there. Not infrequently the one room is filled all night with washing, which must be punctually delivered next morning. Anything more dispiriting and heart-sickening than the Walworth streets on winter nights, in fog or drizzling rain, with pavements and roads covered with fine adhesive and permeating mud, can scarcely be imagined; and the moral effect of what the child sees in the darkness need not be mentioned. And when it is remembered that most of the children are poorly shod, the dismal discomfort of what ought to be the brightest years in life is only too obvious."

The Warden of that Settlement also described how the children were forced to go out from the rooms in which their parents lived to spend their evenings on the door-steps or in the streets, no matter what the weather might be. What had been done? An effort had been made to organise a certain number of schools to which the children might go between half-past five and half-past seven to play, in much the same way as the Minister for Education had described. Describing an experiment in play, Mrs. Humphrey Ward said—

> "Hand-work occupations, such as cooking—both for girls and boys—sewing, knitting, basket-work, carpentering, cobbling, clay-modelling, painting and drawing; dancing, especially combined with old English songs and nursery rhymes; musical drill and gymnastics; quiet games and singing games; acting; and a children's library of story-books and picture-books: these are the pleasures and occupations which the Settlement in Tavistock Place has for eight years offered to the children of the neighbouring schools from 5.30 to 6.30 or 6.45, five evenings in the week, and from 10 to 12.30 on Saturday mornings."

He might remark with regard to the objection taken to dancing that when he visited Dartmouth Training College for cadets the other day, he found that twenty minutes were allowed for dancing every evening, and forty minutes on Saturday evening. All that the Amendment asked was that the local education authority should be permitted, if it pleased, to organise play centres throughout the great cities. Mrs. Humphrey Ward, who had done a great deal of work in this direction, calculated that if about 1,000 children were organised—300 or 400 a night—the yearly expenditure would be about £200. A hundred play centres would thus affect 100,000 children, and cost £20,000 out of the £2,000,000 odd which made up the educational budget of London.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 20, line 4, after the word 'classes,' to insert the words 'play centres.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said the object of the Amendment was to organise play for the children by the grouping of schools. After all that was only carrying out the purpose they had in view, and he was willing to accept the Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

SIR FRANCIS POWELL moved to insert "or elsewhere" in subsection (a) in order to enable the local education authority to provide vacation schools, or means of recreation in places besides schoolhouses. His object in proposing the Amendment was simply that the benefit of the classes, or whatever might be provided, should not be confined to the schoolhouses. In Germany, and he thought in Belgium also, there were in many cases gymnasia in connection with the large schools, but children attending the smaller schools were sent to a common gymnasium. A great economy to the public purse was effected in this way. He hoped that the children would be taught swimming under proper superintendence in swimming baths.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 5, after the word "school-houses," to insert the words "or elsewhere."—(*Sir Francis Powell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said he had no particular objection to these words. They might be useful, particularly in the case of transferred schools, where the use of the school premises could not be obtained out of the ordinary school hours. "Or elsewhere" were very wide words, and it had been suggested that a local authority might give the children a tour round the rld. He had no particular objection the words, and was ready to accept hem with limitations, so that they should be construed as meaning that the recreation was to be carried within a reasonable distance of the school.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he was not so much afraid of the geographical difficulty suggested by the right hon. Gentleman. He did not think that the children would be taken a tour round the world or even into the neighbouring towns. But he thought that the words which his hon. friend desired to introduce for providing at the expense of the rates, spaces for play away from the schools were not only too wide, but dangerous. At any rate it was too great a power to give to the local education authority without very careful consideration.

MR. BIRRELL said that although he quite agreed with the general desire of the hon. Baronet he thought there might be dangers in carrying the Amendment as it stood. The local education authority should not be prevented from carrying out some such scheme as the hon. Baronet suggested.

SIR FRANCIS POWELL asked if the right hon. Gentleman proposed to bring up on Report words to give effect to his suggestion?

MR. BIRRELL: On Report if I can.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield) said that the Amendment standing in his name was necessary not only to give effect to the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for the Elland division, but also to go a little further by vesting in the local education authority a discretion to extend the opportunities to other times than holidays.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 5, after the word 'holidays,' to insert the words 'or at such other times as the local education authority may prescribe.'"—(*Sir James Woodhouse.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said he thought these words might be accepted with perfect safety.

LORD BALCARRES said that the trustees and owners of the voluntary schools taken over as public elementary schools were to have the use of them when they were not devoted to the purposes of elementary education. The Amendment of the hon. Baronet proposed, "or at such other times as the local education authority may prescribe." That carried the question a stage further than had already been provided for. Would it not infringe the rights of the owners or trustees of the school buildings?

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said that the President of the Board of Education, in answer to a Question, had informed him that this clause referred to the ordinary school vacations only, and not to time other than school hours during term. If a wider interpretation was to be given the result would be to interfere with voluntary efforts and agencies which provide happy evenings for the children without any expense to the ratepayers. Reference had been made to such an agency managed by Mrs. Humphrey Ward, and there were others of longer standing which had accomplished very considerable work owing to the charity and personal devotions of subscribers, notably the Children's Happy Evenings Association, under the presidency of Lady Jersey. He feared that these admirable institutions could not continue to exist in the face of a law authorising public bodies to do as much, and more, at the expense of the ratepayer.

MR. BIRRELL said that, there was nothing in the clause to over-ride the agreement between the owners or trustees and the local education authority. The question now was not whether the local education authority should be bound to provide such play centres and means of recreation. It was only a permission to the local education authority, and he was sure that if the local education authority found that these facilities were being given by voluntary associations they would not insist on putting the permissive clause into operation. He thought the clause would be improved by the insertion of the words.

Question put, and agreed to.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the Amendment standing in his name would carry out what the right hon. Gentleman had promised. It only stated plainly that in the case of transferred schools, the use of the schools during holidays should only be with the consent of the trustees or owners. The use of those schools might be extremely important for other purposes by the trustees and owners, and if the section securing that were in the least obscured, as it was obvious that it might be from the way in which the matter was put by the hon. Member for Huddersfield, it would be unfortunate. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see fit to carry out the undertaking which he had given.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 5, after the word 'holidays,' to insert the words 'with the consent, in the case of transferred voluntary schools, of the owners or trustees of those schools.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said that the only possible objection he had to the words of the Amendment was that they would involve an agreement being made in every case. He thought that an agreement should be made one for all. However, he quite accepted the spirit of the words of the hon. Baronet's Amendment, and he undertook to insert words to give effect to his intention on the Report stage.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that after that assurance he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. H. J. TENNANT (Berwickshire) had an Amendment on the Paper to move "In page 20, line 5, to leave out from 'holidays,' to end of clause, and insert—(b) It shall be the duty of every local education authority to make arrangements, in accordance with a scheme to be made by the Board of Education, for attending to the health and physical condition of the children educated in public elementary schools."

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member must move his Amendment in a slightly different form, but the effect would be exactly the same. He must move to omit from "holidays" down to the word "to" in line 6 with a view of inserting the words "The duty of every local education authority to make arrangements in accordance with a scheme."

*MR. H. J. TENNANT said he would move the Amendment in that form. As a Scotsman and as Member for a Scottish constituency he had hitherto not intervened in these debates, but upon this subject he asked the indulgence of the Committee for a few moments. The subject which he wished to bring before the Committee was that of compulsory medical inspection which did not, he explained, mean compulsory medical attendance. He had great confidence in his case. He believed the arguments in favour of medical inspection were overwhelming, and that the objections to it were illusory. His right hon. friend, by the introduction of this clause in the Bill, admitted it was desirable that there should be medical inspection; but he asserted it was not only desirable but essential. The Bill was an Education Bill; it provided for education, and he conceived that education presupposed health, mental and physical. Education in this country was compulsory and universal, and therefore the conditions upon which education depended ought to be compulsory and universal. We ought not to allow the local authorities to differ from the nation in a matter in regard to which the nation had already pronounced. Departmental and Inter-Departmental Committees had considered this subject and it had also been considered by a Royal Commission in Scotland. The Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration at page 91 said—

> "The Committee are emphatic in recommending that a systematised medical inspection of children at school *should be imposed as a public duty* on every school authority."

He would also like to quote the very interesting evidence of Dr. Leslie Mackenzie, Medical Member of the Local Government Board for Scotland, and a high authority upon this subject, given before the Royal Commission on Physical Training (Scotland) 1903. He said—

> "The large number of serious and minor diseases directly and indirectly affecting physical efficiency and mental efficiency constitutes an overwhelming case for a medical inspection of school children."

And again—

> "No systematic exercise ought to be practised or enforced without a preliminary medical examination of the vital organs, to ensure that irreparable damage shall not result."

If these inquiries were not sufficient to show the necessity for steps of this kind, he should like to draw the attention of the Committee to a fresh inquiry which had been made into the physical condition of children in Dundee. It was estimated that in that place 1,500 children suffered from affections of the heart, and such children required constant medical inspection. These children might be permanently injured by ordinary physical exercises. There were ailments which impaired general health, and made it difficult for children to profit by instruction, but defects of the ear and eye made it impossible. If the child did not hear, or see a blackboard, how was it possible for it to gain instruction? It was ascertained in Dundee that only 55·15 per cent. had normal hearing and nearly 7,000 had defective eyesight. Dr. Templeman, at the conclusion of the Inquiry of the Dundee Social Union 1905, said

> "I think that the result of the examination of the Dundee school children materially adds to the mass of evidence already accumulated showing the urgent necessity for the compulsory medical inspection of school children."

The examination of the teeth was of great importance, because if the teeth were imperfect the digestion was impaired. One of the greatest causes of the rejection of recruits in the Army was defective teeth. Out of 69,500 recruits inspected, 4,400 were rejected for this reason, or 63·26 per thousand. This was 10·29 in excess of those who were rejected for being "under chest measurement," the next highest cause of rejection. Of this number 192, or 2·76 per thousand were found to be unfit for service within three months of enlistment. It might be said that the Army did not furnish a standard, as in it they only dealt with the dregs and scum of the population. He resented such a phrase being applied to the Army, and he resented the existence of any class to which the ordinary standards of physical well-being could not be applied. In other countries, such as Germany, Switzerland and the United States of America, they found compulsory medical inspection. Were they going to ignore the experience of other countries and the advice of their own? It might be objected that local authorities would act in any case if left to themselves. Public-spirited local authorities would act with wisdom, no doubt, but some would not, and would be behindhand in this matter. Probably in the cases where the need for action was greatest there would be no action at all. No doubt he should be asked where the money was to come from, and the objection was their old friend the increase of the rates. The Physical Deterioration Committee said that "no large or expensive new staff would be necessary." In Boston, United States of America, the cost of providing medical inspection for the children worked out at 1s. for seven children, and in this country that would mean £35,000 a year on a basis of five million children, which, spread over the whole rateable value of England and Wales, would not be large, would in fact be very small. Supposing they established a small medical department of the Board of Education, it would not exceed £1,500 or £2,000, or at the outside £3,000 a year. The department need not be so large as that of the Local Government Board, whose work consisted largely in the eradication of diseases which had already disclosed themselves in an epidemic form. The duties of this Board, instead of dealing with matters which were past, would be of an anticipatory nature. If the course he advocated were adopted, he asked what would be the saving to the nation. What was the goal to which these children with stunted minds and crippled bodies were drifting? Their asylums, workhouses, and the ranks of the unemployed. Were they not full enough already? Were there not enough canditates? Were we to grease the wheels of the machinery for their further manufacture? Were our schools to be their recruiting stations? Were we to save on the child that we might spend on the pauper? Let us give this elementary right to the children, this elementary justice to the nation. It might be urged that we could not afford to do this thing. He asserted that we could not afford not to do it.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 5, to leave out from the word 'holidays' down to the word 'to' in line 6, in order to insert '(b) the duty of every local education authority to make arrangements, in accordance with a scheme to be made by the Board of Education, for attending to the health and physical condition of the children educated in public elementary schools.'"

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out down to the word 'to' in line 6, stand part of the clause."

Mr. MASTERMAN (West Ham, N.) was sure that there could be nothing like a satisfactory settlement of the education question until we got medical inspection of our schools. We should not have another education Bill for some years, and unless this Amendment were agreed to, the children would for some years be deprived of this elementary right which was granted in Germany and many other countries in the world. His experience in connection with the Children's Country Holidays Fund enabled him to say that, if the House could get personal knowledge of the beneficial effects of medical inspection, it would be willing to vote the necessary funds to enable it to be carried out in the poorer districts. He did not think £35,000 would be sufficient, but one-tenth of the £1,000,000 new grant would be quite enough to establish a universal system. If the Government could not see their way to provide for a universal and compulsory system, he pressed them to encourage local authorities to undertake the work by offering on behalf of the National Exchequer to bear a considerable proportion of the cost. The Government report upon experiments in this direction was profoundly unsatisfactory. In only about eighty out of more than 300 local authorities had any attempt been made at all, and the attempts, even at the best, that had been made in such questions as teeth and eyesight had no kind of relationship to the system carried on in Germany, where the body of the child from the moment it came into the school was made the subject of careful and yearly study, and where, in consequence, all manner of hidden diseases were discovered and treated, and the child was given a far better start in life than it would have without such a system of medical inspection. He pleaded for some central stimulus and inspiration and grant, and urged that parents and teachers would welcome the system, even if made compulsory. He believed the inauguration of such a system would be worth practically all the rest of the Bill put together.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said he hoped the right hon. Gentleman in his desire to make this medical inspection a real and not an illusory thing, would remember that this Amendment was asked for by both sides of the House. The Minister for Education himself was in entire sympathy with it, but hesitated to make it compulsory. The right hon. Gentleman had throughout been sincere in his attempt to make this Bill carry out the original proposals of the Government. That he had not been able to do so was not entirely his fault. It was because the Government and the Party behind him had not permitted him to do so. But the Party behind him would permit him to make this subsection compulsory and the Opposition would support him. In a recent utterance he had stated that the right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench represented public opinion. On this matter of medical inspection the Opposition were united with them in representing public opinion. If a plèbiscite were taken upon this Amendment to-morrow, a great majority would be found to support it. This country stood in rather a different position from our

Colonies in this matter. In the Colonies there was no congestion and the question did not apply there. The poorer people were also better off. The congestion in the United States also was not so great, because there was more room for expansion, but even in the United States the value of medical inspection was shown by the fact that whereas a few years ago 64,294 children were excluded from the schools on account of contagious disease—a branch of the question with which the hon. Gentleman had not dealt—in 1905 the number excluded had decreased to 18,144. That proved that the medical inspection was effective, because it showed that year by year the number of children turned back from the schools on account of disease decreased. Some parents might object, although in the opinion of the hon. Member for West Ham and the hon. Member for North Camberwell they would not. At one time when an attendance officer was sent into the slums of our great cities he often had to take a police officer with him for protection. Now the slums had been cleared and the schools were filled by the children of parents who at one time would not allow an attendance officer to enter their district. If we applied the provision now under discussion to the slum districts of our great cities we should soon find a great change in the physical condition of the youth of the country. His hon. friends below the gangway desired the children to be fed at the public expense in the schools, but although he was not in favour of that he supported this proposal because it would lay the foundations of a healthy, natural life. If the Minister for Education would accept this proposition he believed he would have behind him the bulk of those hon. Members who sat on the Ministerial side of the House as well as those who sat in Opposition. Therefore, he urged that the sub-section should be made compulsory. Under the Public Health Act the local authorities were obliged to have a medical officer of health and it was quite probable that he would also be able to perform this work at no very great expense. There were about 6,000,000 children in the schools, and if the inspection cost one penny per child it would not amount to more than £25,000 a year. But supposing it amounted to £50,000 or £75,000 he ventured to think that the majority of people would infinitely prefer that that sum should be spent in the interest of public health than upon any other purpose under this or any other Act, and he was sure that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be the last man in the world to resist an appeal of that kind for funds out of the Imperial Exchequer. If this inspection was made compulsory he honestly believed that it would have the same effect upon the health and lives of the children in the slums as was produced by enforcing compulsory attendance through the school attendance officers, and there would result a change in the social condition of the people scarcely calculable by those who knew nothing of the life of the poor.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) hoped the Minister for Education would respond to the appeal which had been made to him from the Opposition benches. As one who had spent many years of his life in daily touch with some of the poorest children of one of our great cities he wished to join in that appeal. If they could get this Amendment carried and medical inspection made compulsory, it would be worth all the rest of the Bill put together. The parents would not complain, and far from the teachers objecting he was sure they would be glad to associate themselves with the work. In regard to the condition of working class children, five-sixths of them were better off to-day than ever they were before. Ordinary school life had been greatly improved and parents had taken a pride in sending their children to school clean. The disciplinary results and the whole routine of school-going had generally improved the physique of the working classes. That applied to five-sixths of the children, but the other one-sixth, numbering about 1,000,000 children were never worse off. Day after day in East Bristol he used literally to shudder in contemplation of the fact that it was upon these ricketty shoulders that the burden of the Empire in time to come would have to rest. For this one-sixth of the children there ought to be a medical officer attached to the staff of every education authority, and every child on admission to the school should be medically examined and a record kept. A medical survey of this character would enable them to see what the result of school life was upon the child population. It was not too late to begin. The children in the schools in the slums of the East End and south-east of London should be in touch with the doctor every week or ten days. One-sixth at least of the poor children were almost hopeless, some with running eyes and ears full of matter, and not 1 per cent. of them had sound teeth. This matter of the teeth alone was one of the most important questions they could deal with. If the teeth were all rotten and bad they knew what followed. He would have every child examined on admission and afterwards from time to time, records being kept of their condition. The teachers did the best they could under the circumstances. He remembered one case when he was engaged with a class where a boy in the middle of the class said he could not see the blackboard, and he brought him closer to the blackboard. The result was that he damaged that boy's eyesight, because as a matter of fact he ought to have sent the boy further away from the board instead of bringing him nearer. Had there been any system of medical survey he would have been advised what to do in the matter. In Brussels, one-tenth the size of London, there were sixteen doctors on the schools staff and they examined each child every ten days. In London they had only two doctors and twenty-three half-time doctors for this purpose. On the same scale as Brussels they ought to have at least 160 doctors permanently on the schools staff. This inspection in Brussels cost 10,000 francs, and in London it would not cost more than one-thirtieth of a penny in the £. If the ratepayers objected then they might get money from the Imperial Exchequer. He felt sure that the people would willingly spend the money necessary for this purpose if they were assured of good results. They ought to compel the local authorities to take the matter up, for it was a really pressing problem of much more importance than the things which the Minister for Education had been worried with during the last three months.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said he agreed that this clause was worth more than all the rest of the Bill. He believed that this question of the medical inspection of the children lay at the root of all the questions relating to the physical condition of the people, and it was a matter of national importance. There were certain ailments or defects often unheeded but needing attention, and this attention would at once be secured through inspection by medical men or nurses. To begin with there were ailments arising from uncleanly habits; he understood that the question was best dealt with by the employment of trained nurses. Then there was the question of eyesight, to which a great deal of attention was now being paid, and with the happiest results. A great deal more might be paid, particularly in rural districts, where medical inspection had not as yet found any official place. A more difficult matter, requiring much more time, skill, and attention, was that of deafness, because it was not easy to tell whether what seemed to be deafness arose from sounds being unfamiliar to the child. Then there was the important question of the condition of children's teeth, and in some cases inspection had already taken place. When at the Board of Education he was made aware of a retired dentist of a kindly disposition with professional enthusiasm enough to offer to inspect the teeth of all the children within his area if only the authority would place an arm-chair in every school in which to conduct the operations. But that sort of kindliness was rare, and dental investigations were a matter of time and expense. There were, however, other matters which need not take so much time, and yet would be of great value. Medical inspection might tell whether a child who appeared to be unfit to do the work required in the school was so unfit because it had come to the school hungry, or because it was backward or retarded by mal-nutrition from babyhood, or through improper treatment by ignorant parents, or whether it was physically or mentally deficient, and ought to be sent to a school for defective children. In that way they might clear the ground in some cases and assist the teacher by distinguishing the children who really ought not to be at a public elementary school at all. Then it was very important that children should not be put to physical exercises for which they were physically unfit. He mentioned these things as matters lying on the surface, and as showing the great importance which medical inspection would be to the health of the children, to the satisfactory conduct of the school, and to the nation generally. As to the difficulties that might arise, it was well to bear in mind what was the machinery already in existence. Every local education authority had power to appoint medical officers and nurses, and some had used this power with excellent results. Every urban or rural sanitary authority was bound to have a medical officer, and it would be no great extension of his duties if he were called upon to inspect the children in the elementary schools. Every county council might easily have a medical officer, but of course the difficulty, so far as he had endeavoured to work out the subject, would mainly arise in large rural areas where they would have to connect the medical sanitary officer of the rural sanitary authority with the general organisation of the county. So far as he could ascertain, that would not really be very difficult, though it might require considerable time and trouble in re-organisation. There were powers in existence, but there was no compulsion to exercise them. If it were said that parents might object to inspection, all he could say was that he could not ascertain a single case of a parent objecting where medical inspection had been adopted. He believed that inspection was gratefully accepted by the parent, although the directions which followed the inspection were not always pursued by the parent. There was the question of the time that the medical inspection would occupy, because time in these matters would mean money. He thought a system such as was suggested by the hon. Member for North Camberwell might be worked out, whereby every child on entering the school should be inspected by a medical officer, and again when it left the department in which it was first placed; that the medical officer should mark off such children as he desired to see again in the meantime, and at the same time desire the teacher to call his attention to any children who appeared to require medical atention. In that way they might get a fairly satisfactory system of inspection without requiring the medical officer to inspect every child at short intervals. But if this method was to be successful the teacher must possess some rudimentary medical knowledge, involving a knowledge of the ordinary symptoms of children's ailments. He would not by any means despair of that being accomplished under the existing system of training teachers. There remained the question of cost. The Departmental Committee which sat last year came to the conclusion that in an urban area the cost would not come to more than a rate of one-twelfth of a penny, and he thought there must be very few urban areas that would not pay that sum cheerfully in order to secure adequate medical inspection of the children. Personal inquiries he had made seemed to show that in urban areas the matter of organisation would not be difficult. In rural areas a great deal of re-organisation might be needed, involving more expense, but the difficulties, he thought, were by no means insuperable. All that remained was to require this medical inspection to be made, and he sincerely hoped that whether an addition was imposed on the rates or taxes, or a subvention from the Treasury was made to the local authority to assist them in the matter, the Government would take a friendly view of the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman. It was satisfactory to anyone who really cared for the education of the children that after the wearisome controversies of the last six weeks they had now come to some solid ground on which they felt they could all work together for the benefit, the happiness, and the health of the children.

*SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.) said that what was required was not so much compulsion upon the parents to submit their children to medical investigation, as compulsion upon some of the local education authorities who had been singularly backward in taking advantage of some of the powers they already possessed to appoint medical officers or to secure the assistance of their sanitary officers in connection with the school life of the children. In the Report of the Inter-departmental Committee of last year it was somewhat melancholy reading to find that so little was being done by county and borough authorities under the head of medical inspection. In the case of London, when the County Council took over the work of the late school board, there were two medical officers and six part-time oculists employed by the board. Since then twenty-three part-time medical men had been appointed, chiefly to investigate the diseases and defects of the senses which prevented full advantage being taken of education provided in the schools. Twelve nurses had been appointed, and the County Council had determined to increase that number to twenty. The question of anthropometrical survey might really wait until the future. At present what was urgently required related to the primary needs in relation to child life. Statistics with which he had been furnished showed that in some districts 7 per cent., and in other districts as many as 22 per cent. of the children had been found to have defective eyesight. He could quote many cases which had come under his own notice of children being punished for stupidity or dulness which might have been cured by a pair of spectacles or the removal of adenoid growths. With regard to the very primary matters of cleanliness, medical inspection might be invaluable, for in certain schools in which 119,000 children were examined no fewer than 44,000 were reported as being verminous. Ordinary simple remedies applied for a week or a fortnight would have been sufficient to remove that bane. As in the matter of the under-feeding of school children, so in this the State had made itself responsible in some degree by requiring that children between the ages of five and fourteen should go to a certain place to receive certain instruction for certain hours daily. He hoped that the effect of this clause might be to compel a larger number of local authorities to do their duty in this matter. Outside the Metropolis only forty-seven local authorities had done anything in the way of medical inspection, and he thought such supineness gave occasion for interference. He rather doubted whether it would be desirable to attempt to force medical investigation on every single child, but he hoped that in future the services of wise and tactful medical officers might be used for the benefit and the welfare of child life in schools, and that the schools might not continue in the future as they had sometimes been in the past, the means of propagating infection.

*Sir HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said there was no part of school work more interesting and important than that which related to the physical condition of the children. The Department with which he was for many years connected first directed attention to it by instituting an inquiry into the physical condition of school children in 1901. In connection with that, an inspection was made of individual schools both in Aberdeen and in Edinburgh. Medical experts examined a large number of scholars, and although there were occasional objections on the part of parents, he was able to state that they were useful as showing how easily they could be got over, and how small in number they were as compared with the number of parents who not only permitted the inspection, but were grateful for the help thus given to them in regard to the health of their children. The revelations which were brought out by the investigations of these experts were in themselves something that might give the Committee pause. They proved, if proof were required, how absolutely necessary it was that some such work as that contemplated by the Amendment should be carried out. He believed that the local authorities had already powers in their hands. What was wanted was that the right hon. Gentleman should introduce something in the Code which would make the carrying out of these powers, which were so necessary in connection with the health of the children, a condition of the payment of the Parliamentary grant. That was what he wished to see, and he urged the right hon. Gentleman, to introduce such a condition It was essential, if they were to learn how to train the children, that they must learn more about their bodies and their health. In the elementary schools far too much of the work had been spent in mere intellectual training, in book work and blackboard work. It was surprising during the investigations of the Commission on Physical Training to see the extraordinary contrast between the attention given to corporal training and to health in secondary and high class schools as compared with elementary schools. In the secondary schools, at least one-third of the time in the week was devoted to physical training, while in elementary schools the time given was about twenty minutes three times a week. If the children were to be properly equipped for the work of education, medical inspection must be carried out as part of the educational work of the schools.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.) said it was quite true that local authorities had already the power to appoint medical inspectors, but for the past seven years he and his colleagues on a town council of which he was a member had been hammering at the council trying to persuade them to appoint one or two medical officers for this purpose, but they had absolutely failed. The reason given was that the rates were so high that it was impossible to burden them further. In West Ham the rates amounted to 10s. 8d. in the £. A right hon. Gentleman on the front Opposition Bench had said that medical officers might spare the time to give some attention to this matter, but he thought medical officers had plenty to do already, He hoped the Minister for Education would not be timid about accepting this Amendment, because, as showing that public opinion was behind it, he might mention that the principle had been unanimously approved at ten successive Trades Congresses. Therefore, he hoped that this all important Amendment would be accepted, and he was glad to think that at last the Committee was giving more attention to the bodies of the children and less to their souls.

*MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham) hoped the Amendment would be accepted, though he admitted that the question of cost was a difficulty which they must face. They were now, however, spending a great deal of money on education to no purpose by attempting to teach children who were not physically fit to receive instruction, and a good deal of that waste might be prevented by a compulsory system of medical inspection. Let them begin by saving money in this respect if they had to spend it in other directions. He believed the Committee were practically unanimous on this point. He had had fifteen or sixteen years experience in the district of West Ham. He had seen a large number of children turned out of the board schools who were quite unprepared to make a living or to become effective members of society. The first remedy for that evil was the proper inspection of the children. The cost of that could be lessened in the manner suggested by the hon. Member for North Camberwell and the hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University. They should begin by inspecting all the children as they entered school, and setting aside those most unfit, who should be thereafter regularly inspected. Then, he would suggest that they should have to assist the doctors some trained nurses who would be much less costly than doctors. In fact, the nurses, if properly and scientifically trained, were as good as, if not better, for the purpose with young children, than doctors themselves. He had seen that system in operation in the United States with the most beneficial effect, while it seriously reduced the cost of the inspection. He ventured to hope that the Minister for Education would take into account the speeches and able arguments adduced on both sides of the House, and, knowing quite well the great need there was for this medical inspection, that he would see his way to accept the Amendment. even if he had to modify it in some respects on the Report stage.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) said that it had not been made quite clear whether the Amendment was intended to cover the cost of the treatment of the children as well as the inspection.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT said he thought he had made it clear that he did not intend to include treatment as well as inspection.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN believed that there was some danger, by drafting the Amendment in too wide terms, of the local education authority being involved in the expense of the treatment of the children as well as the inspection. The Committee were practically unanimous that medical inspection was necessary, but not that inspection should carry with it after-treatment. He was not so sanguine of the results of medical inspection as some hon. Members, because nearly every one who had spoken in the debate had left out of account the early stages in the life of the children before they attended school. He believed he was right in saying that a large proportion of the ailments from which children suffered at school had been very much aggravated by the treatment which they had undergone before they went to school. It would be far more likely to bring about the result desired by hon. Members if it became necessary that every child by the time it was a year old should be medically inspected in its home. He was convinced that many children of the poor had ailments so fixed upon them at these tender years that it was far more difficult, if not impossible to remove them at a later time. He was not at all sure that this whole question was not of such great importance that it required to be treated separately from the question of education. He had no conception of what the views of the President of the Board of Education were on this subject, but he hoped that no one would go away with the idea that by merely medically inspecting the children in the schools that would accomplish all that so many hon. Members expected.

*MR. A. WILLIAMSON (Elgin and Nairn) said he was Chairman of the Liverpool District Nursing Association, by whom this work of inspection and attending to the children's health had been most successfully carried out by the Queen's Nurses, who were paid by the subscriptions of the public. Their object had been to get the Board of Education to give a grant to the Association in assistance of this work. The local education authority might pay for medical inspection but not for nursing. The local education authority valued the work of the nurses immensely, because it had improved the attendance and condition of the children. If the Amendment of his hon. friend were carried, half or two-thirds of the cost of inspection and nursing which would otherwise be borne by the nursing institutions of the country would have to be paid for by the local education authority. When they were dependent on purely school nurses the work would not be of the same quality as when nurses were employed who had district work as well, and who had had a scientific training for three years in a hospital. To employ medical men solely for inspection was to increase the number of officials in connection with education, which he thought was undesirable. Another thing to be borne in mind was that it was desirable to follow up the children in their homes where the Queen's Nurses could attend to them.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT said it was not the intention of his Amendment that the medical men should follow up the cases to the children's homes; but it was quite possible that they or the nurses could follow up the cases.

*MR. A. WILLIAMSON said that in Liverpool they had twenty-two schools in which the children were nursed by Queen's Nurses, and last year 60,000 ailments were treated by them. The Nursing Association had said to the local education authority that they would undertake to nurse all the schools in Liverpool if they granted £40 a year for each nurse. By adopting the Amendment they would do away with all voluntary effort and get an inferior quality of nurses.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken was the only critic of the Amendment on either side of the House. There were occasions when the whole scope of expressed opinion seemed to be going in one direction, while other Members were silent for one reason or another. He hoped that that was not the case on the present occasion. It had been proved that immense benefit could have been done to the children of the present generation if some such scheme as was suggested by the hon. Gentleman had been adopted in former years. He did not feel confident to press on the Committee that side of the case; but the hon. Member for North-west Ham, who spoke from personal experience of what had occurred in certain elementary schools in which the system had been adopted, had told them of the most obvious and most marvellous advantages which had resulted from it to the children concerned. Very few hon. Members were able to correct or supplement that personal experience. At any rate from the hon. Gentleman's personal experience the result had been that the health of the children had visibly improved. The hon. Member for North St. Pancras, who spoke with very great authority on all these questions not only as an educationist but as one well acquainted with the working of our local authorities seemed to think they ought to approach this matter only from the practical side, and not to attempt to obtain any scientific basis for future conclusions as to the effect of our social system — educational, sanitary, housing—upon the fortunes of our population. He associated himself with the hon. Member for North Camberwell in the statement that if we had twenty-five or thirty years ago established some such method of investigation as was now proposed, we might have been able to build our conclusions on a more solid foundation. The problem of urban life was really the problem they had got to consider—it was not the country. He did not in the least desire to limit the benefit of the Amendment, but, after all, it was in the great towns that they wanted both the remedial changes which could be produced, and that basis of knowledge in which they were most lamentably and sadly deficient. They had been in the habit of making speeches about the effect of overcrowding and devoting themselves to the consideration of the deplorable influences which urban life had on our population. Let them now get at the real facts of the case. He was himself wholly sceptical about the idea that the next generation would be weaker than this, and the generation after that weaker still, and so down an infinite process of retrogression. He did not believe it. The population of this country must more and more be an urban population. No man, however much he believed in what was called "return to the land," sincerely believed that, if the population of this small island was really to increase to any large extent, more than a small fraction of the increase could be among the population engaged in agriculture. If they admitted that, as they must, the problem of the health of the town was really the complete problem they had to face. He did not believe the health of the town was worse than it was. It was incredible to suppose so when they considered what it was in past times. On what did they spend these huge sums for sanitary improvements? Why were our rates mounting up to 10s. in the £? Had it all been thrown away? Surely not. But of course the evil effects, such as they were, of urban life had enormously increased, although the conditions of our towns were healthier, simply because the proportion of our population in the cities had increased. This was not a digression, it was really pertinent to what was the most important problem before them. It led up to the conclusion that it was worth while for this House to spend money upon anything that would give them a really solid scientific data on which they could calculate the effects which modern urban conditions produced on the mass of our population. He therefore earnestly suggested that the Government should carry out this Amendment if they thought it practicable. He would desire not to restrict their attention merely to what he might call the medical aspect of the problem as it affected the children at the moment. Let them not be led away by the counsels of the hon. Member for North-west St. Pancras; let them rather take counsel from the hon. Member for North Camberwell, and other hon. Gentlemen, and accept compulsory medical examination, if not in this form, then in some other. Let them see that it was carried out on a general scientific plan, a plan applicable to the whole country, a plan which would enable them to compare area with area, children under one condition with children under another condition, and the children of one generation with the children of the next. When they had done that, and not till then, they should have some really solid scientific basis for what was now too often merely rhetoric and speculative conclusions about the effect of modern civilisation upon the health and progress of the race. The question was a very big one, and he did not speak of what might be the great practical difficulties in the way. The Government were now in the unhappy position of having to consider those practical difficulties, and if the right hon. Gentleman told him they were insuperable, he should accept his word. But he hoped they were not insuperable, and if they carried out this scheme, which was of first-rate importance, let it be done thoroughly and not merely in what he might call a philanthropic spirit.

MR. BIRRELL said there was a time when a public elementary school was a place where the small children of the locality went for very limited purposes—to learn reading, writing, and arithmetic. People did not look beyond that, and that made the work of the Minister for Education, and also the burden of the ratepayers, comparatively light. Time was, thirty or thirty-five years ago, when these were the ideas that generally predominated, and that played a leading part in the debates which then took place in Parliament. But they now lived in another world, and ever since he had been at the Board of Education he had been pursued by deputations of learned men and zealous men and women, who looked upon schools as places where not merely reading, writing, and arithmetic were more or less badly taught, but as places where they were to consider the health, the future happiness, and what he might call the breed of the English-speaking race. Well, those were new ideas to the Board of Education, they were extensive ideas, and they sought to impose upon the Board of Education duties which he did not know that the Board was the best body to carry out. But so far as he felt that these were opportunities for benefiting the future generations of this country, he was eager to avail himself of every one of them, and he could assure the Committee that this was a part of his work in which any man in his place would naturally take the deepest possible interest. Therefore, everything that could be done he was anxious should be done to promote the health of the children. The question seemed to him to be divided under two heads. First, leaving out for the moment the question of population, what were the duties they would desire to see performed by the local education authorities, assuming that they were all alive to their duties, and were not, as they well might be, frightened by the heaviness of their rates? The duties were of a two-fold character. There was, first, the inspection, a medical inspection, of the child when it went to school. He did not know whether that was best taken at the infant stage or after completing that stage. But he entirely agreed that it was most desirable in the interests of true and accurate information, as to the people for whom they were labouring, to see what kind of people they were, and to compare one generation with another. He deeply regretted we were so behindhand in these matters. This medical inspection was also of very great value as indicating to the teachers what congenital weaknesses the children might have, in order that they might be treated properly in the class. They had heard a great deal about defective sight. He himself all his life had had to contend with that adversary. Certainly, he never in his life saw anything on the blackboard except, perhaps, the map of Africa; as to figures on the blackboard, he never saw one during his school career, which might account for many deficiencies. He had been condemned in the moment he was born to wear spectacles. Similarly ear and throat troubles were among the things which were easily detected at once by a very simple inspection by practised medical men. Every school ought to keep a precise register of the result of this inspection, which would not only serve a scientific and a national purpose, but would also be available for indicating what treatment children ought to receive while at school. The inspection need not necessarily be very expensive, although doctors, like all other professional men, required to be paid. They must bear in mind the possibility of the duties sometimes overlapping those of the officers of the Local Government Board. Reference had been made to the kind of work which might be done by nursing. There was some little red tape difficulty, he believed, as to how far a nurse could be considered to be an officer within the meaning of the Act, if she did not give her whole time. In large towns nurses were to be got from institutions. He was glad to think that in many country villages, owing to the generosity of country gentlemen, the nurse was also becoming a familiar figure. But in large towns nurses were to be obtained from institutions; and, if they were employed in connection with schools, it would not be necessary to engage their entire services. In cases of serious illness the nurses in Liverpool, who, his hon. friend had told them, had attended 60,000 children suffering from bad cuts, burns, and other things of that kind, were able to follow the children home and point out to the mothers the treatment that should be followed. These suggestions were always most thankfully received. But he thought they might disregard what they might call the malignant parent. Every schoolmaster was acquainted with the cantankerous parent who objected to his child receiving the ordinary treatment of the school. He thought they might very well disregard such parents in the matter of nursing also. In Liverpool, however, mothers welcomed the visits of the nurses, and were most anxious to learn from them how best to look after their children. But the question before them was whether they should make obligatory the duty on the local authority to provide for the medical inspection of children attending the schools. He confessed that in this matter he was in the hands of the House. The difficulty he saw was not so much in the way of securing that the particular duty should be carried out by particular medical men, but the obligation on the part of the Board of Education to compile schemes and impose them on the local education authorities. In this matter of medical inspection he was willing to submit to the judgment of the House that it should be made obligatory on every local authority to provide for the medical inspection of every child on application for admission to a public school and on such other occasions as the Board of Education might direct. The Board of Education was equally willing to receive inspiration from the House in the direction of strengthening its medical staff at headquarters for the purpose, not of carrying out the inspection of the schools—for that, of course, must be done by local doctors to be appointed by the local education authority—but of seeing that the local authorities were discharging the duties which they have at present power to discharge, and also to keep in touch with what was going on in Continental towns, from which, he admitted, we had much to learn. But what he was not prepared to accept was the further suggestion in the Amendment that the Board of Education should prepare generally, for town and country, schemes for the medical inspection of school children. The conditions of districts were so totally different and the physical circumstances of children varied so much that the preparation of general schemes would require an amount of consideration and care beyond the power on an already overworked Board. But apart from that he was quite willing to put down for the Report stage of the Bill an Amendment to the following effect—

> "It shall be the duty of every local authority to provide for the medical inspection of every child on its application for admission to a public elementary school, and on such other occasion as the Board of Education may direct or the local education authority may think fit."

*MR. H. J. TENNANT asked the right hon. Gentleman to continue the words after that to record and correlate the statistics.

MR. BIRRELL said he took it it would naturally follow that each local authority would collect the same statistics.

DR. MACNAMARA said he understood about the anthropometrical sphere. That was to be the data, but he wanted to point out that in the great urban centres it was most desirable to have a continuous inspection to be in continuous medical touch with the children in the schools. He wanted to make that point quite plain, and desired to know whether what the right hon. Gentleman had said would apply to the fact that it should be obligatory in the poorer schools to have the children continually examined by the medical officer.

MR. BIRRELL said that was not in his mind at the time. It was not in his mind that there should be medical treatment.

DR. MACNAMARA: Not treatment —inspection.

MR. BIRRELL: But continuous inspection would necessarily mean treatment.

DR. MACNAMARA disagreed, and said if there were continuous medical inspection there were many agencies which might be brought into play to take over the treatment.

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.) said this was a most important matter, and that while he was quite willing that there should be medical inspection in any schools in which he might be interested, he should very much object to medical treatment. In the case of adenoids, that was absolutely harmless, and many people might object to having their children treated for it.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT said he was particularly careful to guard against medical treatment—periodical medical inspection did not include treatment.

SIR GILBERT PARKER pointed out that one medical inspection was not sufficient to be of any use; it must be periodical.

MR. MASTERMAN said he did not think the words suggested by the right hon. Gentleman carried out the desire of the Committee. Unless there were continuous inspection for cleanliness that inspection was of no use at all.

*MR. H. J. TENNANT said the Committee had had a most interesting debate, and he was very grateful to his right hon. friend the Minister for Education for the sympathetic attitude he had taken. They had struck a great blow for the children and for the race. He begged to ask the leave of the Committee to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn

MR. ASHLEY moved an Amendment to limit the expenditure which might be incurred under this subsection in any one year to an amount not exceeding that which would be produced by a rate of one penny in the pound. He agreed that it was necessary that as much attention as possible should be paid to the physical condition of the children, especially in our big towns. They might best consider what further power should be given to the local authorities by considering what had been done up to the present time. He understood that the local education authority had power to provide gymnasia and baths. Further, they had the obvious duty of preventing the spread of infectious disease from one child to another, and therefore they could medically inspect the child to see if it were suffering from infectious disease. The medical officers of the London County Council had the power to inspect children's eyesight, and the authority had endeavoured to bring pressure to bear upon the parents to supply spectacles for their children when necessary, although they had no legal power to compel the parents to do so. Children who went to school outrageously unwashed were refused admission, and parents were threatened with the law in order to compel them to look after their children. He desired to bear testimony to the good work that had been done by the London County Council in respect to improving the physical conditions of the children in London. He thought they on those benches who did not always agree with the policy of the London County Council must agree that their policy so far as the physical condition of the children of London was concerned ought to be supported in every way, and that the thanks of London ought to be given to the hon. Member for West St. Pancras for the leading part he had taken in helping forward this excellent work. They had to consider what extra powers should be given to the local education authority. Although it might seem a small matter, it was obviously right that the local education authority should be given power to purchase spectacles for the children, but he did not think it would be contended that it would require more than 5s. per child per annum to provide spectacles for each child that wanted them and for the medical inspection that the Committee had decided should very properly be carried out. The Amendment he now moved would not in any way hamper any legitimate work by the local education authority, but would prevent any tendency on the part of the authority to outrun the constable.

Amendment proposed—

"In clause 35, page 20, line 6, after the word 'arrangements,' to insert the words, 'not involving an expenditure in any one year exceeding the amount which would be produced by a rate of one penny in the pound.'"—(*Mr. Ashley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) thought it would be contrary to principle in a matter of this kind where they had just imposed an obligation upon the local authority to put any limit upon their expenditure. At the same time there seemed to be no reason to apprehend that the expenditure under this clause would amount to anything like the limit suggested by the hon. Member. A penny rate all over England would amount to about £700,000, and no one could anticipate that medical inspection and other provisions likely to be made under this section would come to any sum of that kind. He thought it was unnecessary to put in a limit, and, moreover, it would be contrary to principle to make an obligation and then impose such a restriction as this. The Government could not accept the Amendment.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said perhaps his hon. friend would withdraw this Amendment. The difficulty could not be practically dealt with by limiting the expenditure on the particular objects in this Bill, and the moment for supporting such a plan was not the happiest when they had just imposed an obligation upon the local authority. He thought that the end of legislation of this character would be that the taxpayer would have to come to the help of the ratepayer on a very large scale. That was a question they could perhaps debate more successfully on a future occasion.

MR. ASHLEY asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) wished to tender to the Minister for Education his cordial congratulations upon being able to address the Committee in a time of total abstinence from bitter controversy. He would also venture to thank his right hon. friend for the spirit with which he had met the various proposals that had come before the Committee, and he was inclined to tell his right hon. friend it was a pity he did not take the country into his confidence at the beginning of the preparation of the Bill, because it might then have met the wishes of the House in far more complete measure. He proposed to move to insert words giving the local authority power to make by-laws subject to the approval of the Board of Education, to enforce the attendance of children at evening continuation schools or technical schools up to the age of seventeen years. If the Amendment were adopted the local education authority would have power to make by-laws, subject to the approval of the Board of Education, to enforce the attendance of children at evening continuation schools or technical schools up to the age of seventeen. One of the considerations of the utmost importance was the amount of hardship imposed upon the parents of the children who attended these schools. He was a member of a school attendance committee many years ago when they began imposing compulsion upon the parents to send their children to school, and it was found to be a hardship. In those days they were taking children away from the earning of money and compelling them to attend school. To day he was not imposing anything which would entail hardship upon any parent, because, after all, the attendance at these schools would be only for two or three evenings a week during the dark months of the year, or a maximum of 120 hours in the year, those hours being the least valuable in the way of earning money. Every one knew that a large amount of the work done at school was lost by the pupil a few years afterwards. He cited his own personal experience. Every boy who entered the service of Brunner, Mond, and Co., below the age of fourteen was bound to attend an evening continuation school up to the age of seventeen. Later the period had been extended to nineteen years, and that was the general rule now.

With apprentices they went further, and said they must attend these schools until the age of twenty-one. The parents had been called together and were consulted as to the adoption of compulsion, and he had the greatest pleasure in stating that not one parent out of many hundreds had a word of objection to offer as to the imposition of compulsion. One of the happy results of this system had been that large numbers of other boys and girls had come forward to submit to the system, so that the character of the population in the two neighbouring villages had been completely changed. His firm, moreover, were better served as the outcome of this educational method, and he thought that if the same rules were applied universally the same good effects would be forthcoming. If by adopting his proposal the Committee could bring about the same result in all the villages of the country it would be an extremely happy piece of work. The Amendment he proposed left it optional on the part of the local authority. He had not the courage to make the amendment obligatory on the authorities, but he wanted to make a beginning and to secure that the children should not forget what they had learnt in the schools. If his Amendment was not suitable to factory districts at least they might try what he proposed elsewhere, and perhaps the example set by other parts of the country and the benefits which followed would prove an inducement to the factory districts to shorten their hours of labour. He appealed to the Labour members to support his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 6, to insert '(b) Power to make by-laws, subject to the approval of the Board of Education, to enforce the attendance of children at evening continuation schools or technical schools up to the age of seventeen years.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WYNDHAM said the Committee had listened with interest to the speech of the right hon. Baronet and with much of what he had said many hon. Members would agree. They were all aware that in many cases the benefits which the children derived from elementary education were entirely lost in after life, but he asked the Committee to pause before accepting the present proposal. There was a danger that they might interfere too much with the family life of the people if they transferred parental responsibility at every turn to the care of the State. His own experience of these institutions at Chester showed him that there was a great deal of keenness on the part of the scholars to learn just because they were enabled to satisfy their thirst to acquire knowledge voluntarily. That keenness of desire in the scholars re-acted very favourably on the teachers, for to them it was a change as from the treadmill to a delightful occupation when they were imparting the knowledge sought for and asked for by the scholars. But compulsion meant the formation of a plan and rigidity in the curriculum. One of the advantages in the work of continuation schools was its variety in the giving of a liberal education, and compulsion meant restricting the teaching within certain rigid limits. He therefore hoped that the Amendment would not be accepted.

SIR W. ROBSON said that he had great admiration for the educational efforts of his right hon. friend, though he thought that his experience was being misapplied when he wished to make the system so successful of results in his own case universal. One of the effects to be looked at was the influence of such compulsion on employment, for the Amendment would enforce attendance on the part of the scholars. The child who was compelled to attend school was relieved from industrial work, but under the Amendment a young man, who had done his day's work would be compelled to attend evening classes in addition. That was not shortening the hours of labour. The Government could not accept the Amendment. Compulsion was a very ungracious and difficult task in the case of children under twelve years of age, but how much more difficult would it be in the case of boys and young women up to seventeen years of age! The proposal would involve a very heavy addition of intellectual labour in the case of many, and, he dared say, in the case of most people. It would be hard if young men who had done their day's work it might be as clerks or in a severe form of manual labour, were to be compelled, irrespective of their condition, to receive education in the evening up to the age of seventeen. If public opinion strengthened on this matter, Parliament or the Government might be prepared to take further steps.

Dr. MACNAMARA said he fully sympathised with his right hon. friend. He agreed that the real weak place in our system was that we lost touch with the children at far too early an age, and that a great deal of the money we spent on education was put into a bag with holes in the bottom of it. The existing law permitted a child to go to work as a half-timer in the agricultural areas at eleven years of age, provided he made 250 attendances out of 400. The Amendment would compel a child then to go five years to a night school for the period set out. At twelve years of age a child might go as a half-timer in a factory, if he passed the legal standard for a half-timer, and at the same time he might go on full time if he had passed the full time standard and made the necessary attendances. Under the system proposed by the Amendment the children would have to go five years to a night school. At the age of fourteen, no matter what his qualification, a child was free from school. It should be remembered that this Amendment was rendered impossible largely by the reactionary Act of 1899, introduced by the Solicitor-General, under which a child engaged in field work might become a half-timer at the age of eleven.

Sir W. ROBSON said that that Act added to the child's school life and to his opportunities of recreation. If it were reactionary, it was a pity there was not more reactionary legislation.

Dr. MACNAMARA said that the Amendment would be simply cruel in the present state of the law. It would be necessary, first, to shorten the hours of labour and raise the age of school exemption.

***Sir WILLIAM ANSON** supported the Amendment. The hon. Member for Morth Camberwell had somewhat exaggerated his right hon. friend's proposal. He talked as though there was to be universal compulsion, and that the law would fall heavily on children from the time they left the day school. The proposal was that the local authority should have power to make by-laws requiring compulsory attendance, subject to the approval of the Board of Education. It rested with the local authority, having regard to the state of public opinion in its area, to make by-laws or not as it thought desirable. Everybody regretted the rapidity with which children forgot what they had learned after they left school, and everybody desired that their education should be prolonged, if only to make sure that they would retain what they had learned. There was another reason advanced by the advocates of evening classes—a moral, rather than an intellectual, reason, namely, that it was desirable for the youth of towns that some occupation should be provided to keep them off the streets, and give them something to learn which would interest and be of value to them. These were good reasons for pressing this matter on the attention of the Government. He did not agree with the denunciations of the Solicitor-General and his Act of 1899 which they had heard from the hon. Member for Camberwell. He had always thought that it would be of great advantage if they could get the children on to the land sooner in the rural districts so far as that could be done consistently with the continuation of their education. He did not suppose anyone desired that children who were hard worked all day should be compelled to go to continuation classes, any more than that teachers who were possibly working at an ungracious task throughout the day, should be compelled to teach, whether they wished it or not, at evening classes. But if they could by some relaxation of school attendance in the rural areas impose a condition that attendance at evening continuation classes should be given later on, he believed they would do a great deal to keep children on the land by giving them an interest in rural pursuits at an early age and so counteract the prevailing wish to go off to the towns. The real difficulty was as to the age at which compulsion should cease, but he believed it was not beyond the wit of man to devise a scheme, and he thought it might be left to the local authority to consider whether the public opinion of the district justified compulsion.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.) said he opposed the Amendment simply because he did not think there was any proposal which met with more opposition from the working classes. This matter had been under consideration at Glasgow, and while the workingmen wished that boys could be persuaded to attend evening schools after the age of thirteen or fourteen, they could not see their way to approve of the principle of compulsion. He agreed with the hon. Member for North Camberwell that those who were anxious for this principle at all should assist in raising the school age. He would prefer that the children should not be permitted to leave school under fifteen or sixteen years. That was the policy advocated by the working classes. He himself had to leave school at an early age, and he found that after getting to work he lost interest in the school. If evening schools were to be continued, attendance thereat should not be made compulsory, but boys and girls might be persuaded by parental encouragement to go to them. In that way more would be got out of them than by compulsion. He trusted that the Committee would not pass the Amendment.

*MR. MADDISON (Burnley) said that the right hon. Baronet who had moved the Amendment had probably done as much as any man in the House or country for education. His enthusiasm for education had taken the best of all forms, that of giving solid cash to advance it; but he was sure that the object which he had at heart would not be secured if the Amendment were passed. He himself had long thought that something would have to be done with regard to the larger development of evening schools, and that compulsion might eventually be necessary; but he thought the argument of the hon. Member for North Camberwell was unanswerable that this was not the time to do it. He agreed with the hon. Member for North Camberwell that if the Amendment became law it would paralyse the efforts of those who desired to lengthen the ordinary school life of the children, because they would be told that a child's education was going on in the evening schools. In the case of half-time boys and girls working in a weaving shed, spinning mill, or factory, as he understood the position, they already suffered by the half-time system, but they would be hereafter compelled to go to an evening continuation school. He did not hesitate to say that if he were a parent he would object to his boy having to make an enforced attendance at an evening continuation school after undergoing many hours of hard work. He hoped that his right hon. friend would not press the Amendment to a division, otherwise he would find himself in conflict with a large number of Members who were in sympathy with him, and supported him in his general education policy. They had heard something about the land. He did not know very much about the land; he was town bred. True, he wanted a large number of his fellow citizens to go back to the land because really he was not selfish; but personally he preferred to get his living, if not in public life, as a compositor in the city. Still, he could not for the life of him see that it was the business of the Education Department to keep little boys on the land. The land was an excellent thing, but the school was the place for children up to fourteen years of age at least instead of their being employed in hoeing turnips, or acting as scare-crows. He did not want any sort of idea to prevail that workmen would support any proposal which, however good it might be under proper conditions, would have the effect of preventing the lengthening of the school life of the children, which they believed to be one of the greatest blessings that could be bestowed upon them.

MR. HICKS-BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said that as an agricultural Member he believed that this was an Amendment that found very great favour in the country not only with the employers of labour, but also with the parents themselves; and for this reason, that in the agricultural districts children might be allowed to leave school in the summer months to earn a few shillings at work upon the land. The children enjoyed it; it benefited the parents; and the farmers liked it. It was found that when the children got beyond the age of twelve and thirteen years and were sent to work on the land, they were absolutely useless. [" Oh. oh,"] What they were being taught in the schools was useless to them for working on the land. [" Oh, oh."] That was true nevertheless. At the same time he quite agreed that something might be done during the winter, in evening classes, to give the boys instruction which would be invaluable to them all their lives. But there was the obvious difficulty that a child was not at his best for receiving education in evening classes after he had spent the best hours of the day working in the fields. It was the ambition of all hon. Members to do something to keep the people on the land, and therefore he favoured additional means of instruction for the children of peasants in the winter months, but it should not be made compulsory.

SIR PHILIP MUNTZ (Warwickshire, Tamworth) said that he sympathised very heartily with the suggestion of the right hon. baronet, but he must be excused for saying, as a man who had had considerable experience, that it might lead to an amount of friction which hon. Members could scarcely realise. It was most desirable, he agreed with the hon. Member for North Camberwell, to continue the education of the children as long and as far as they could, because if they left school at the age of fourteen by the time they had reached the age of eighteen they had forgotten all they had learned. It was desirable that boys should go on the land as early as possible, and it was his own experience that boys who went to work early in life became better artisans than those who went at the age of sixteen or seventeen. He ventured to say that in many employments at the present time the workmen were not as efficient as they were fifty years ago, because they did not go to work at an early age.

MR. MADDISON: What does the hon. Member call " early " ?

SIR PHILIP MUNTZ: What is reasonable, either for artisans, or for agricultural labourers.

MR. MADDISON: What is reasonable ?

SIR PHILIP MUNTZ said they wanted these people to improve their minds on the land or in the workshop, but the difficulty was how it was to be done. He agreed with the hon. Member for North Camberwell that they could not enforce compulsory attendance at evening continuation schools, but they could make these schools attractive and persuade the young people to go there on their own initiative. He was in favour of the half-time system, but they could not expect boys who were employed on laborious work during the day to be compelled to attend evening schools.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) said he agreed with the right hon. Baronet's motive in bringing forward the Amendment, but as the Government were not disposed to accept it the Committee should not waste their time in giving reasons against it. Compulsory attendance at evening schools was not altogether an impossibility, as in parts of Germany, at all events, persons who left school at a certain age were compelled until they reached a higher age to attend evening schools. He thought the Amendment was objectionable on account of its vague character. The right hon. Baronet had not given any idea as regards the age at which compulsion would be necessary. If a person left school at sixteen years of age, it might not be necessary for him to attend evening classes, but if he left school at twelve it might be. Another matter which the Committee must bear in mind was that children who left school early, too often forgot what they had learned and were consequently unable to take advantage of the evening schools. That involved the loss of a great amount of money to the country. The pupils who were attracted to evening classes were rapidly increasing in number, and they belonged to the industrial classes. None were more responsible for this great improvement than manufacturers of the type of Messrs. Brunner and Mond, who encouraged young people in their works to attend those schools. He should deprecate the acceptance of the Amendment also for the reason that it would have the effect of preventing manufacturers from taking the deep interest in the education of the people employed in their works which they now evinced.

Sir JOHN BRUNNER thought that his action might be mistaken outside if he pressed his Amendment to a division, because he should appear to be in opposition to a great many Members whose objects were the same as his. He therefore asked for leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Mr. MASSIE (Wiltshire, Cricklade) moved to insert a sub-section as follows, providing that the powers of the local education authority under Part III. of the Education Act, 1902, should include—

> "(a) Power to provide, in public elementary schools, instruction of scholars in day schools up to the end of the school year in which the scholar reaches the age of sixteen."

He said the effect of the Amendment would be to raise by one year the age at which children had to be turned out of the public elementary schools. Section 22 of the Act of 1902 fixed the age at between fifteen and sixteen That might mean fifteen plus one day, or sixteen minus one day, and the average worked out at fifteen years and a half. He proposed to raise the age to be between sixteen and seventeen, which in the same way would work out at an average of sixteen and a half years. It was true that the Government grants would not continue payable with regard to the instruction given to such scholars. For many years they had been payable up to eighteen years of age, up to which age they still continued payable in Scotland and Ireland; but the non-continuance of the Government grants should not prevent local authorities from receiving these children and training them at their own expense if such a course was thought desirable. As it was now, not only did the Government grant cease at a point between fifteen and sixteen, but the local authorities were positively forbidden to continue to receive children beyond that age. The origin of this arbitrary exclusion was the well-known Cockerton judgment in 1901. The actual question of age was not raised in that case by those who were in effect crippling elementary education, and it was not even argued by their counsel. The judges themselves raised that question. Mr. Justice Kennedy said that elementary education was established for the welfare of children and not for adults. He did not say anything more definite than that, but Mr. Justice Wills was more definite, because he intimated that between sixteen and seventeen an age was reached which no one could call childhood. Why had the Government of the day gone one worse than the Judge and fixed the limit at from fifteen to sixteen? The Amendment which stood in his name was in accordance with the suggestion of Mr. Justice Wills, that the age should be between sixteen and seventeen. Of course they had been told that the secondary school was the proper place for a child between sixteen and seventeen. That might be all right in theory, though it seemed to him to depend very much upon how long the child could stay at the secondary school and it did not answer in practice. The number of children who were in a true sense fitted for a secondary school was severely limited. That number might be gauged by the fact that all the local authorities in England taken together provided an aggregate of only 13,000 scholarships, and the number of children available for those scholarships was 2,400,000. After all secondary school provision had been made for the clever children in the elementary schools, an enormous number of children remained whose need was completer elementary education, or rather some extra teaching which might fit them for the industrial life upon which they were about to enter. He knew of many parents who were willing and anxious that their children should remain at school for a longer period, when they had attained fourteen or fifteen years of age, if they could be in the same school, under the same teacher, in the same educational atmosphere and—this was a practical point—with the same suit of clothes and without paying higher fees. He had known parents receive with genuine sorrow the notice that their children would no longer be received in the school. He thought it was but faintly appreciated how many unfinished articles, even as regarded elementary education, were turned out of our elementary schools. In the County Council schools of London, where the teaching was most excellent and an excellent system of compelling attendance prevailed, nearly 40 per cent. of the children left at the age of fourteen without getting beyond the fourth standard, which was the standard for children between the ages of ten and eleven. Many causes contributed to this unsatisfactory and unprofitable result, such as early neglect, frequent illness, prolonged absence from school, slow development in the intellect of the child. But there were many children who, encouraged by their parents, would be willing to redeem the time by remaining in the school for a year or two longer. One wondered why these children should be excluded. There was no such exclusion in Scotland or Ireland, and why should they be excluded in England, especially at the time when the intellect of the child often took a new start? Many hon. Members had, he thought, been startled at some figures given to him in reply to Questions which he had asked the previous week as to the number of children over fourteen years of age who were still attending the elementary schools in the three divisions of the kingdom. According to the latest figures available, taking 1,000 as the numerical basis, the proportion in England was 10·6, in Scotland 28·3, and in Ireland 64. As to Ireland, many of the children went to school at the age of twelve or thirteen to learn to read and write. There was less child labour in that country and there was a great deal more looseness about absent children being allowed to remain on the register, and these facts among others perhaps accounted for the figure in regard to that country. It must be borne in mind that the children who were allowed to continue their education belonged to parents of the most enlightened class, parents who exercised considerable self-denial in their action. Why, therefore, should these parents and children be discouraged? Why, when parents were willing that their children should continue at school until they were sixteen or seventeen, should they be forbidden? England was already backward, why should she be made more backward by statute? It was not proposed by this suggestion to compel the children to attend or the authorities to receive. All that was asked for was that in particular cases where parents, scholars, teachers, and authorities, were willing, the novel and pedantic limitation of the Act of 1902 should henceforth cease and that exclusion should operate between the ages of sixteen and seventeen, and not between the ages of fifteen and sixteen. He asked for this on behalf of the mass of the children of the elementary schools who could not go to a secondary school.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 6, to insert 'as power to provide, in public elementary schools, instruction of scholars in day schools up to the end of the school year in which the scholar reaches the age of sixteen.'"

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BIRRELL said his hon. friend had made a most excellent speech on the subject matter of his Amendment, but he hoped he would not press it too severely, because he believed it would really check and discourage a great number of most zealous educationists who had established in our large towns secondary schools on the principle of what was called the four years course. The object of the four years course was to get the child to go into these schools at the age of twelve on the understanding that he would be allowed by his parents to remain four years and get the benefit of the course. He agreed that no scientific distinction could be drawn between what was primary and what was secondary education. Anyone who went to the public elementary schools knew that in the higher standards there was an amount of education being given which was properly secondary education, and if they went to the secondary or higher grade schools they would find in the earlier classes there was a great deal of what was called primary education. The only distinction in the matter was that in the secondary schools they strove to get an assurance from the parents that the children would be allowed to attend the school for a definite period, so that the work could be spread over with the knowledge that the child would get the benefit of the four years course. It was not quite the case, as his hon. friend had suggested, that there was no means of allowing the children to remain in an elementary school beyond the period named, because in Section 22 of the Act of 1902 there was a provision that the local education authority, with the assent of the Board of Education, could extend the limit, provided there was no higher education school in the district. There was, therefore, no hard and fast rule prohibiting a child after he had reached a certain age from attending school. They need not now go into the question; the pre-Cockerton days were over. The Act of 1902 seized an opportunity and made different arrangements, and they did not now say that in public elementary schools nothing but elementary education should go on. The distinction made in the Act of 1902 was the distinction between the elementary and secondary schools, and no hard and fast line was drawn between what must be taught in the one and what in the other. They need not therefore, concern themselves with that. The real difficulty here arose from the fact that it was all right in county boroughs and counties where they had complete jurisdiction over both Part II. and Part III. of education, but that the autonomous districts as they were called, the non-county boroughs and certain districts with a particular kind of population claimed the right to and did provide their own elementary but not their own secondary education. There was no power in the non-county boroughs to provide both primary and secondary education. The effect therefore of the Amendment would be to allow children to remain in the elementary school of a non-county borough longer than they were now doing, with the disastrous result that the elementary school would come into competition with those secondary county schools which had been established. That he thought would be a very serious blow to education. He knew that there was an objection to these secondary schools on the ground that they were too classical and too humanitarian in their curriculum, and that they were not up-to-date because they did not teach science and mathematics as they ought to do. But there were schools of different types according to the wants of the neighbourhood, and it was quite a mistake to suppose that a child who went to a secondary school would get that sort of clerkly education which would unfit him for earning his living as an artisan. The keeping of a child from year to year living intellectually a hand to mouth existence in the elementary schools would deal a blow at what was most dear to the hearts of most educationists who had established secondary schools which had met with great success in many of our large towns. Working class parents were beginning to appreciate the fact that it was the wisest thing, and that it was best for their children to go to these schools. What they wanted in the secondary schools was to see children of all classes mixing together and receiving the same education according to their particular wants. He would be sorry if the idea got into the heads of the parents that these secondary schools were a sort of genteel place where children of the artisan class, or those who wished to follow the crafts, should not go. He hoped that in the present condition of education, when we had had people toiling and moiling since the Act of 1902 to establish technical and secondary schools, and when the local edcuation authorities were waking up to the fact that schools of all types should be established, a blow would not be struck at that system. He did not in any way wish to limit the curriculum of the public elementary schools or interfere with or keep down the level of the higher grade schools. But do not let the Committee strike a blow at the higher grade schools by inducing parents to believe that it was better for their children to remain a year or two longer at the elementary school than to avail themselves of the advantage to be derived from the secondary schools. Teachers could proceed to work on different lines, and secure much greater results if they knew their scholars were going to remain under their tuition for four years. He did not wish to say anything disrespectful of the public elementary schools, but he did think it would be a pity to encourage the children to remain on year after year instead of taking advantage of the instruction at secondary schools. If there were any faults to be found with the curriculum of the secondary schools let them be corrected, but let them not strike a blow at those schools. He could not accept the Amendment of his hon. friend and he hoped he would not press it.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said he was sorry he could not agree with his right hon. friend in the line he had taken. No educationist would oppose the recent policy of the Education Department to develop the system of secondary schools, but his quarrel with the Department was that it had been developing secondary schools at the expense of elementary schools. They had had too much of the University man and the public school man at the Education Department; his influence had been not altogether for good. The responsible authorities of the Department in order to develop the secondary system had dealt very serious blows at our elementary school system. It was perfectly true that they could not draw a line between the elementary school and the secondary school, but they knew there was a difference between them. The atmosphere of the two classes of school was quite distinct, and as a matter of fact the secondary tended more and more to become a sort of school for higher education in gentlemanliness and respectability. They might deplore it, but it was the case. The moment they sent the child into the atmosphere of the secondary school and brought it into contact with its influence and ideas, a different point of view was put before the child, who was made to occupy a different standpoint altogether in life. He did not for a moment dispute the educational advantage of sending a child to a school where it entered upon a carefully-planned curriculum for four years. It was, undoubtedly, a great advantage to a child who wanted to attend that kind of school and to emerge from it moulded in the spirit and in the character of the school. But there was also another great necessity, and that was to make the elementary school teacher feel that he was not merely a teacher of the lower standards, but that he was required to turn out children fully equipped for their duties in life. If they impressed on the elementary school teacher that if a child on reaching twelve years of age showed special ability it was to pass from his control and care, they would do the worst possible thing for elementary education. They had heard references to the excellence of the Scottish system, but that excellence depended on the fact that in the Scottish board school they could get better and more efficient teaching than could be got in English secondary schools. Since they had interfered with the Scottish education system by the attempt to differentiate between so-called secondary and elementary education the English influence upon Scottish education had been altogether for the bad. Let them remember that the country depended not merely upon an efficient secondary system, but upon an efficient, self-respecting, proud elementary system, and they could not have that if they were constantly skimming the milk, passing the cream on to other schools, and leaving behind the more backward and less promising children to be beaten into shape by the uninspired elementary teacher. The great intellectual poverty which had hung like a pall over so much of the elementary education of England had been largely owing to the fact that elementary education had largely consisted of the more simple exercises of education. When they had succeeded in getting more democratic influences at the Education Department they would have an improved *status* of elementary teaching. There were children who wanted something between simple education given in the three R's with the small additions that had been made, and the four years carefully-planned curriculum of the secondary school. They wanted an education which would make them good artisans. The secondary school was professional in its atmosphere and led children to look down upon any career except a professional one. Children who were going to follow a profession should be given the advantages of the secondary school, but those children who did not want to follow a profession should be allowed to stay in the schools to which they had been accustomed by proper education being provided for standards VI. and VII. and ex-standard VII. The reason the last years of a child's life in an elementary school now were probably the most barren of school life was that no provision was made for higher education. By enabling elementary schools to provide those facilties they would elevate elementary education, without doing anything to militate against the system of secondary education which they were glad the Education Department was doing its best to establish in this country.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) said he differed from the view of his right hon. friend that the growth of the elementary school system was being fostered. One natural growth of the elementary school system was the higher grade board school, the extinction of which showed that that system was being stopped. When his right hon. friend suggested that it had been replaced by municipal secondary schools in every part of the country he was bound to call to mind that there were only some seventy schools in the country so far, that a fee was charged in these schools, that the committees which managed these schools were not permitted to give an adequate number of free places in them, and that the management of the schools was removed from the democratic committee who arranged the elementary schools. He would assume that his right hon. friend was correct in saying that a great number of children in the elementary schools ought to proceed to a secondary school. The object of the Amendment was the assistance of pupils who did not go to secondary schools, and who by a prolongation of their time in an elementary school might develop latent qualities that had not appeared in their earlier years. There was need for such a provision, and he regretted that the Minister for Education did not see his way to adopt it.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON could not agree with the distinctions drawn by the hon. Member for Leicester: Each kind of education had its purpose and its place in our system and all were equal in so far as they fulfilled the purpose for which they existed. He did not admit the distinction of one class of teacher over another. Elementary, secondary, or other, the teacher did his best to develop the mind and form the intelligence of the pupil in his charge. The hon. Member had assumed that secondary schools developed class distinctions, but he would be sorry if that were so. The only object of the Department in its regulations for secondary schools was the preparation of boys and girls for their work in life. The greatest care was taken to give them a good basis of general education, and beyond that the scholar could specialise in any direction that would be useful to him, but the prolongation of time at the public elementary school would serve no good purpose. If a boy had attended school from five to fifteen years of age, it was useless for him to continue marking time for another year, playing at being a boy when he was becoming a young man. There would be no advantage, but rather injury to the boy, and it would have a bad effect on the teacher and the character of the elementary school. The attention of the teacher would be distracted from the general work to a small group of pupils whose time at the elementary school had been prolonged. What they were mostly concerned with was the raising of the standard of the average student. If the children wanted something between elementary and secondary education there was the higher elementary school to meet the case of students who had not the time for the secondary school course and who wanted something more than the elementary and something more suited to the career in which they were going to embark. For these reasons he should find very great difficulty in supporting the Amendment.

*MR. MASSIE said he was satisfied with the discussion which had taken place, though not with all that had been said; and he asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. MADDISON said the Amendment he had to propose sought to give power to the local education authorities to train pupil teachers as part of their ordinary work of elementary education. He believed in the superiority of the pupil teacher centre system over that of the secondary school, where a poor man's child often found herself in an atmosphere pervaded by a "nasty class feeling." He appreciated the necessity for imparting to the teacher the fullest culture and refinement, but maintained that there was no training of that kind given at many of the secondary schools that could not be given at the pupil teacher centre. He submitted that it was the natural and even the traditional duty of elementary schools to train their own pupil teachers. Under the old system that training was received at the school in which the pupil teacher was engaged, and was given by the headmaster or the headmistress or some other teacher, and in that way some of our best head teachers had been trained. In course of time it was felt to be rather a clumsy method to make pupil teachers dependent upon the aptitude of a particular headmaster or headmistress, and for that and other reasons the pupil teacher centres were set up. At these centres the training of elementary teachers was conducted and many of the very best teachers who were in charge now of some of the largest schools were the product of that system. He would not now deal with the agitation which lead to the Cockerton judgment, which he thought was regarded upon the progressive side as an attack upon popular education, and it was generally agreed that the work of school boards in this direction had been curtailed and largely destroyed by that judgment. He believed he was right in saying that those who promoted the Cockerton judgment never had in their minds any desire to interfere with the pupil teacher centres. They were undoubtedly very determined in their attack on the higher grade schools which they thought were competing unfairly with the secondary schools. The judgment centred round the question of the age at which a child could be educated at an elementary school. The age of sixteen was obviously one which covered a large number of those attending pupil teacher centres, and, although these institutions largely went under, there was good reason for saying that the Cockerton proceedings were not primarily intended to be directed against them. He did not share the opinion of those who believed that it was better that boys when they reached a certain stage in their education should go for their further training into secondary schools. The higher grade school of the old school board was the workmen's best form of higher education. But pupil teacher centres stood apart from these, and he hoped that the Minister for Education might see his way to accept the Amendment. The objection which was raised against the previous Amendment would, he imagined, be raised against this one. The argument was that it was desirable that the pupil teachers who were to have the training of the children of the working classes should become more and more cultured. He would make a candid admission. He had gone into board schools, and when he had heard teachers training children he had wished that they had brought more refinement to their work. He quite admitted that education did not consist entirely in teaching a child that two and two make four. But was it a fact that pupil teachers who were sent to secondary schools got more culture and refinement than they did in the old pupil teacher centres? Speaking of London, he ventured to dispute the proposition altogether. A daughter of his had attended the pupil teacher centre at Battersea where the headmaster was a gentleman who afterwards became an inspector. The fact that he was considered fit to be appointed an inspector might be taken as an indication that the centre was really one of the best secondary schools that young people could be sent to. His second girl was sent to a secondary school. The school was one of a number mentioned in a circular which was sent to him stating that they were open to her for the purpose of her probation. These girls' middle class schools were in the main attended by pupils who came from suburban villas, and the pupils might know how to do their hair, what sort of frock they should wear, and how to hold their knife and fork—excellent things no doubt—but if a girl was not dressed up to the average of the others attending the school, she would have an unpleasant time. That was an actual fact. The girl was not necessarily in an atmosphere of culture. Let not the Committee run away with that idea. Culture was not necessarily to be found in suburban villadom. There was another objection. The pupil teachers were hedged round by a lot of rules and conditions, and they ought to be protected. What protection did the secondary school girls get? They were not subject to the conscience clause. They were not subject to many of the safeguards which were enforced in the elementary schools. They were part of the elementary system of education, and he contended that all the culture and refinement that was necessary could be obtained as well in the pupil teacher centres as in secondary schools. The hon. Member for Oxford University knew all about the Oxford pupil teacher centre, and must be aware that the chairman of that body proposed a scheme for a new centre thoroughly equipped with everything which was needed for higher education, and with laboratories—a scheme which was recommended by Professor Sadler. But, in opposition to that scheme, one of His Majesty's inspectors said that it was the policy of the Board of Education to abolish the pupil teacher centres and to use secondary schools instead, and the result was that the young people were sent to the Oxford High School and another denominational school in which there was neither a laboratory nor any of the apparatus necessary for the training of pupil teachers. He submitted that for a large number of years the system recommended in the Amendment was in actual operation with the best results, and that the pupil teacher centres were capable of development and contained within them all the possibilities of secondary schools. He ventured to say that if the President of the Board of Education would accept his Amendment he would be doing something to give real effect to popular education. The Amendment did not raise any wretched religious squabble; it was only meant to advance real education, and therefore he hoped they would get a satisfactory answer from the representative of the Government. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"To insert at the end of the clause '(a) power of training and preparing pupil teachers up to the date of their entering a training college or becoming assistant teachers.'"—(*Mr. Maddison.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.) said that a long time had elapsed, and a great deal had taken place since the case of hardship referred to by the hon. Member for Burnley. So far as he could follow his hon. friend, he dealt with London more than with the provinces, and he had spoken of most excellent pupil teacher centres in the Metropolis, and especially of one at Battersea. He acknowledged the excellent work which had been carried on by these pupil teacher centres in London, of which there were formerly twelve; but as a matter of fact seven or eight of them had gradually developed into most excellent secondary schools.

*MR. MADDISON: Only half of them are doing their proper work.

MR. LOUGH so that at any rate they were doing excellent work. There were seven or eight girls secondary schools maintained by the London County Council and facilities were given in them for training pupil teachers. He maintained that to take the step recommended by the hon. Member for Burnley would be equivalent to setting back the hands of the clock. Pupil teachers had hitherto been as a rule badly trained, and the Government believed that they would receive a better training in secondary schools where they would breathe a somewhat different atmosphere and meet with all classes. Those secondary schools were now managed by the same education authority as the elementary schools. Then there was the question of money. A large amount of money was now devoted to secondary schools, and even in small urban districts a levy of 1d. rate could be made to supplement what was being done by the county council for secondary education. Altogether for the reasons given the Government could not possibly accept the Amendment on its merits.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that the hon. Member for Burnley had challenged him as to what was being done at Oxford. Of his own knowledge he could testify to the excellence of the two secondary schools in that city, and negotiations were now going on the result of which would be that the boys intending to be teachers could get their instruction as pupil teachers at one of the secondary schools before going into the training colleges, which he thought would be very much to their advantage. His own belief was that the future of the pupil teacher would be that an intending teacher would get his education at the secondary school, and his training as a teacher at the training college. In those happy conditions the education of the teacher would improve and the output of the training colleges would increase, because the period devoted to the training college would probably be reduced. He could not think that the hon. Member wished to place the pupil teacher in the position he was in before the Cockerton judgment. The pupil teacher would get at the secondary school what every teacher wanted—a good general education—and he would then be better fitted for the preparation he would get at the training college. He believed that the system now proposed by the Board of Education was the best possible, under present conditions, for training teachers, and that it was a most important factor in promoting the general education of the country.

*MR. MADDISON said that after the statement of the President of the Board of Education on the previous Amendment he wished to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD moved as an Amendment to include among the powers of a local education authority the power to aid by scholarships or bursaries the instruction in public elementary schools of scholars beyond the age or standard of compulsory attendance. He argued that any attempt to curtail the dignity and importance of elementary schools or to limit the work of elementary teachers would be a profound mistake from the point of view of elementary education, but he did not want to emphasise that point too much, because it had already been raised and the opinion of the Committee expressed upon it. It did not, moreover, cover the whole scope of his Amendment. The hon. Baronet the Member for Oxford University had an Amendment on the Paper to his Amendment to leave out "beyond the age or standard of compulsory attendance," and to insert "from the age of twelve up to the limit of age fixed for the limit of instruction in a public elementary school by Section 22, subsection (2) of the Education Act of 1902." That would be an exceedingly important improvement for the Board of Education to grant, because the other day the President of the Board of Education in answer to a Question put to him by an hon. and gallant Member on the Opposition Benches, had stated that two-thirds of the education authorities in rural districts granted exemption to children at the age of twelve. It was obvious that a child who left the elementary school at that age and probably never saw the inside of a school again and never came under the influence of education or of teachers, could not possibly be fit to discharge the duties of life. When they looked into the figures which the right hon. Gentleman gave, and acquired some knowledge of the conditions in which the children lived and of the reasons which prompted the parents to apply for exemption, they could see at once that it was a mere matter of poverty which rendered it impossible for parents to allow their children to go on attending school. If the local education authority had the power to grant scholarships and bursaries it would be brought within the power of thousands of children to continue to attend school up to the age of thirteen and fourteen and to proceed higher later on. Everybody who had been connected with a local education authority or with education must have been met with this difficulty, which was also one of the great obstacles experienced in getting the children to attend technical schools. What happened was that when they had reached a certain amount of proficiency the parent came and said that he was not able to keep his children at school because of the pressure on his means. There was only one way of meeting that and it had been adopted by the Technical Education Board, who had established a system of maintenance scholarships. For the first year the grant was, he thought, £10, for the second year £12 10s., and for the third year £15. Such a system enabled the parent to keep the child out of the labour market and enabled the child to reap the full benefit which the ratepayers intended to confer. If a system of maintenance scholarships could be justified in regard to technical education, it could be justified ten times over as part of our ordinary educational system. There were no doubt a number of children who would not be benefited if they had to attend secondary schools. But there was no class of children who would not be benefited by attending elementary schools up to the age of fourteen. His proposal was that not only should the local education authority be enabled to grant fee scholarships, but maintenance scholarships up to the age of fifteen, and he would be very glad if the Board of Education would meet him in this matter and say that it should be in the power of the local authorities to give these scholarships beyond the age or standard of compulsory attendance.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 20, line 9, at the end, to add the words 'and (c) power to aid by scholarships or bursaries the instruction in public elementary schools of scholars beyond the age or standard of compulsory attendance.'"—(*Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Dr. MACNAMARA said that the late school boards, under the pressure of the needs of the working classes, had to make considerable provision for the continuance of education, but that was all cut away by the Act of 1902, which said that they must eliminate and co-ordinate. The elimination had been carried out very thoroughly and even now they had had a refusal from the Treasury Bench to provide for a continuance up to the age of sixteen. He had obtained a Return a few days ago which he would ask all the Labour Members and those interested in this question inside and outside the House to study. It showed that there were many urban districts scattered up and down the country without a scholarship of any kind for the children of the working classes. In many of the English boroughs also there was not a scholarship available for the children. If a child happened to be born in Dundee, for one of every twenty-three scholars there was a scholarship of some sort. In Perth there was a scholarship for one out of every eighty scholars, while in Dunfermline there was a scholarship for one out of eighty-five. The borough of Accrington and that of Burslem both contained a considerable number of children, but there was not a single scholarship available. He regretted the hon. Member for Cambridge was not in his place, because he wanted to point out to him that while in that place there were 6,147 elementary scholars in attendance upon the schools, there was not a single scholarship or bursary available for them. The Return gave the cases of great boroughs where there were 5,000, 6,000, or 7,000 scholars and not a single opportunity of going beyond the limit of elementary instruction. In cases, moreover, where there were 20,000, 30,000, and 40,000 scholars there were only two or, perhaps, four scholarships. He did appeal under these circumstances to his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education to give the local authority power to make better provision than this. In Exeter and other cathedral cities and also in Chester the number of scholarships was very large, whereas in large places like Smethwick and Burslem such provision was entirely lacking. In agricultural counties also, where there were perhaps 20,000 or 30,000 children, some of whom, although born of humble parents, migh have great capacity, the provision of scholarships was sadly needed. He did not ask that the 20,000 or 30,000 children should be carried forward, but in the agricultural areas there would probably be 5 per cent. of the children whom it would be desirable, for the benefit of the nation, to carry forward to something better in the way of education than anything which they could obtain to-day. He had never read a more humiliating Return, and he contended that some general provision should be adopted whereby scholars both in boroughs and in counties should be enabled to carry on their education in order to give them a better chance in life.

MR. PAUL (Northampton) said we had a system of elementary education, a system of secondary education, and a system of higher education, but we had no system of education as a whole. He supported the Amendment, because it was a step in the direction of bringing these three systems together and making them into one. There were no such foundations in the world as those of Winchester, Eton, and Harrow, and for the last half-century and more the entrance into those foundations had been purely intellectual, yet how little had those foundations contributed to the literary or scientific life of the country. The reason was not far to seek. It was because they were not connected with the elementary school system of the country, but were simply private adventure schools, cramming institutions for the vulgar art of pot hunting. The examinations for these foundations were so constructed that the pupils of the elementary schools could not compete. It was useless to say that all people were born equally intelligent; they were not so, and Parliament could not make the people equally intelligent, but it could give them, and they had a right to have, the same equal intellectual opportunity before the law to rise in the world. That was what the educational system of the country now denied them, and that was what this Amendment proposed to give them, and he supported it because in his belief it was a step in the right direction.

MR. BIRRELL said that if he accepted the Amendment at all he would find it easier to do so after it had been amended in the manner proposed by the hon. Baronet opposite. The real effect of the hon. Member for Leicester's Amendment was to induce a parent to allow a child to remain a little longer at a public elementary school by giving, in the form of a bursary, the equivalent of what might be earned if the child left school at once. The only objection he had to raise to the form of the Amendment was that he did not wish to do anything to deplete our secondary school system, which had been slowly built up in the large towns and was receiving a large amount of municipal support and local enthusiasm. To tempt a parent by giving the equivalent of his child's labour was hardly the right way to go to work. He was in favour of extending the term of years of compulsory attendance at schools, and he hoped an opportunity would occur during the existence of this Parliament of dealing with school attendance. He did not think his hon. friend's Amendment proceeded quite on the right principle. He quite agreed that we were lamentably deficient in this country in scholarships for children attending our public elementary schools. He did not want to do anything which would seem to limit the increase of these bursaries. He wished it were possible to persuade English millionaires to behave with the same generosity as Scotsmen had shown. Scotland had become a country of bursaries. It was the cheapest country in the world in which to get a good education. It would, he feared, be many thousand years before England reached the same stage.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON said that if it were in order he would now move his Amendment to the Amendment of the Member for Leicester, which would provide for power to aid by scholarships or bursaries the instruction in public elementary schools of scholars "from the age of twelve up to the limit of age fixed for the provision of instruction in a public elementary school fixed by Section 22, subsection (2), of the Education Act, 1902." He was anxious that local authorities should be able to offer some inducement to children to remain at school after the age at which exemptions from attendance might begin.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'beyond the age or standard of compulsory attendance,' and insert the words 'from the age of twelve up to the limit of age fixed for the provision of instruction in a public elementary school fixed by Section 22, subsection (2), of the Education Act, 1902.'"—(*Sir William Anson.*)

Question proposed—

"That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

DR. MACNAMARA hoped his right hon. friend would not accept the proposal of the hon. Baronet, because it would only enable a scholarship in an elementary school to be given beyond the age of twelve up to fifteen, and that would only carry a boy a little distance along the road. They wanted scholarships or bursaries for bright lads beyond the age of fifteen in secondary schools. They would have to get a much more general system than they had now.

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD said he understood the Minister for Education was prepared to accept his Amendment as proposed to be amended by the hon. Member for Oxford University. He did not accept the reasons that had been urged, but as this was a substantial step, he was prepared to accept it if the Government would agree to it.

COLONEL WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.) objected to the proposed Amendment to the Amendment for the reason that the scholarships provided by the higher schools were taken great advantage of at this moment. There was hardly any school in England which had not the power of offering scholarships to boys of elementary schools, and a very wise provision it was. But this proposal was entirely different. It was not a proposal for scholarships at all. It was putting a burden upon the rates which ought not to be put upon them. It was paying greedy parents to keep their children at school when they wanted them to go to work, and he hoped, therefore, this Amendment would not be accepted.

Sir William Anson.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said he was very strongly in favour of anything that would enable the elementary scholars to proceed to secondary schools. He believed that the powers possessed by the authorities were to some extent used, although he regretted it was very small extent, and anything the Board of Education could do to increase the use of those powers would certainly earn the gratitude of the country. But it struck him that the present Amendment opened up a very difficult question.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment," put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted in the proposed Amendment.

Question put, "That the words, as amended, be there added."

MR. GEORGE WHITE said that unless it was proposed to make this arrangement universal, which he did not expect was the object of the hon. Member for Oxford University, it seemed to him that members of education authorities would have opened up to them the prospect of having to examine parents as to their powers of sending their children to school without this assistance. In the days of school fees no more unpleasant duty was forced upon school boards than that of inquiring into the wages of parents to see whether they could or could not afford to pay the fees for their children. In this case some inquiry would have to be made as to the financial ability of parents to keep their children at school until the age proposed. Unless some further explanation was given as to what would be the plan of operation he should be compelled to vote against the Amendment, although he was very anxious to assist any scheme to give scholarships to boys who had passed the elementary stage of education.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes) thought it better that the scholarships should be held at the secondary tha at the elementary schools, because a boy or girl of twelve years of age who was up to scholarship standard would have exhausted the capacity of the elementary school. He was anxious to provide scholarships for children whose parents were too poor to pay for the completion of their education, but it would be a blunder to give scholarships to keep a smart youth at an elementary school. He should be obliged to vote against this Amendment because he did not think it was the right way to deal with the question.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said that he agreed with the last speaker. He had been for many years on the governing body of a county secondary school to which a number of children came with minor county scholarships from public elementary schools, and were then helped on by means of major county scholarships to the University. The hon. Member for Northampton was perhaps not aware how much had been done by county scholarships. [AN HON. MEMBER: There are very few in some counties.] The remedy for that was not to discourage counties which had done their duty in this matter. He was afraid that if this Amendment were accepted it might stop that process. He was in favour of the scholarship system and he hoped it would spread, but he could not support this Amendment.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said he came from a county where a system of scholarships for secondary schools was being developed. They wanted to get the children who had qualified for leaving the elementary schools before they reached the age at which they might leave school and give them a scholarship. He would much prefer an Amendment like this if it gave more scholarships to secondary instead of elementary schools.

MR. BIRRELL said there was nothing inconsistent between the scholarships aimed at in this Amendment and the secondary schools scholarships. A child went to a secondary school with a scholarship at the age of twelve and went through a four years course. There was nothing inconsistent between this kind of scholarship and the other. He hoped that as time went on the secondary schools would vary their curriculum sufficiently to give an advantage to children who proposed to follow a handicraft rather than to mere clerkly persons. As things were at present it was difficult to find a secondary school of that sort, and it might be very useful to keep a child at a public elementary school. The power proposed was permissive, and no county would allow it to interfere with the general system of secondary education, of which he was an enthusiastic advocate. As things stood at present there was room for both. He hoped a vote would now be taken.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) opposed the Amendment, on the ground that the object was not to send the child to a superior school. The Amendment merely proposed that money should be paid to parents for allowing their child to stay at an elementary school. Any hon. Member who supported the Amendment under the impression that it was going to give an intelligent youth some chance of advancement would be woefully mistaken.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 391; Noes, 86. (Division List No. 218.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, JohnEmmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, SirJ. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J.H. (Essex, Romford)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, Arthur W. (Bedfordshire
Boland, John

Bolton, T. D. (Derbyshire,N.E.
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brunner, Sir John T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, Rt.Hn.Jas. (Aberdeen)
Bryce, J.A. (Inverness Burghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Buxton, Rt. Hon. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, SirT.Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazelton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman(SomersetN
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson. E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Sir James
Laildaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, HughCecil(St.Pancras, E.
Leese, SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza.
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow,W.)

O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W.D. (Colchester)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S.M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester
Scott, A.H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J.W.H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rthen
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesborough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J.T. (Huddersf'd
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Lloyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert Lanark (Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hill, Henry Staveley (Staff'sh.)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareham)
Lehmann, R. C.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl

Radford, G. H.
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, AbelH.(Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool,Walton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid
White, George (Norfolk)
Willoughby, de Eresby Lord
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk,Mid.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Colonel Williams and Mr. Rogers.

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 18th June, to put forthwith the Questions necessary to dispose of Clauses 35 and 36.

Question, "That Clause 35, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and agreed to.

Clause 36:—

Question put, "That Clause 36 stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 337; Noes, 136. (Division List No. 219.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Armitage, R.
Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, JohnEmmott(Somers'
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbo'r'e
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexh'm)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, J.H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Black, ArthurW.(Bedfordshire)
Bolton,T.D.(Derbyshire, N.E.)
Boulton, A. C. F. (Ramsey)
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,SirJohnT.(Cheshire)
Bryce,Rt.Hn.James(Aberdeen
Bryce,J.A.(InvernessBurghs)
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt.Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,SirT.Glen(Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardig'n
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol,S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Grove, Archibald
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B.(Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Cairhn'ss-'h
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,ColonelIvor(Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hill,HenryStaveley(Staff'sh.)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope,John Deans (Fife, West
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.

Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Kitson, Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry

O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.

Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Wallace, Robert
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dunbartonshire)
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williamson, A.
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord (Norfolk, Mid
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell

Anstruther-Grey, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.

Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balcarres, Lord

Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H.T(Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn.Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bright, J. A.
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, Geroge
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Clancy, John Joseph
Coates, E.Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Crean, Eugene
Cullinan, J.
Delany, William
Devlin,CharlesRamsay(Galw'y
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Douglas, Rt.Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V.(Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Field, William
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, Col. H.B.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm's
Hill, Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.SirJohn H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King,AlfredJohn (Knutsford)
King,SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareh'm
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Lundon, W.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down,S.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Killop, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mooney, J. J.
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Murphy, John
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Wm.G.(Petersfield)
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor,James(Wicklow,W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker,SirGilbert(Gravesend)
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Power, Patrick Joseph
Rawlinson, John Frederick P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton
Smith, Hon. W.F.D.(Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Sullivan, Donal
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'dUniv
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath,North)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt.Hn. C.B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Samuel Roberts and Mr. Butcher.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Birrell*)—put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

NETTLEBED AND DISTRICT COMMONS (PRESERVATION) BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

Read a second time, and committed.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) [ADVANCES].

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient to authorise the repayment to the Ireland Development Grant, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of such annual sum as may be advanced out of that fund, in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Law relating to Labourers in Ireland, and to make provision with respect to the application of portion of the Ireland Development Grant."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.) said he wished to draw attention to the fact that this money Resolution would have an effect on the counties of the North of Ireland. For instance, the county of Ireland a portion of which he represented was entitled to £3,466 per annum——

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) pointed out that the Resolution before the House was one affecting money to be taken from the Irish Development Fund for the purposes of advances to the Irish labourers' cottages. The hon. Member for East Down was going into the consideration of Clause 18 of the Labourers Bill by which it was proposed that there should be a new distribution of certain grants which had nothing earthly to do with the Report stage on this financial Resolution.

CAPTAIN CRAIG submitted that the whole question of the finance of that Bill was based upon this Resolution. Therefore he insisted he was perfectly entitled to discuss what share each county should have in the distribution of the money under this Resolution.

*__MR. SPEAKER__ said that Exchequer grants which were already made could not be discussed. This Resolution only had reference to grants to be made hereafter.

CAPTAIN CRAIG said in that case he would raise this question in Committee.

Question put and agreed to.

CROWN LANDS [RECOVERY OF CROWN RENTS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient that no proceedings shall be taken by or on behalf of the Crown for enforcing the payment of any quit rent or any other perpetual rent payable to the Crown in Ireland, or any arrears thereof, but within sixty years from the time when such rent was last received by or on behalf of the Crown, and that after such period the right of the Crown to the rent and arrears shall be extinguished in pursuance of any Act of the present session to amend the Crown Lands Acts, 1829 to 1894.—(*Mr. McKenna*).

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton) asked what was the sum of money involved in the Resolution put from the Chair.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) said it was impossible to say what sum was involved because they did not know what number of cases would come before the Estates Commissioners. The Treasury would under no circumstances claim quit rents for a period beyond sixty years. This clause was introduced at the request of hon. Members opposite.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) asked whether the clause was to apply to the future or the past.

MR. McKENNA said it applied to the future. If the money on a sale of an Irish estate fell into the hands of the Estates Commissioners it was held to be doubtful whether they should pay the money over to the landlord or to the State. In order to facilitate the Lands Purchase Act this clause had been inserted.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD asked whether he was to understand that the Motion before the Committee was that quit rent in arrears for sixty years should be dropped.

MR. McKENNA said the quit rents would be collected up to sixty years; those beyond would not be collected. That was the law in England at the present moment, and was believed to be the law in Ireland until a recent judicial decision.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) asked whether it was a fact that the quit rents collected in Ireland were spent in beautifying London parks.

THE CHAIRMAN said that question did not arise on this Motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

POST OFFICE SITES (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 10 agreed to.

Clause 11 :—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That clause 11 stand part of the Bill."

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he had always objected to special powers being granted to the Crown to the detriment of private individuals. Whenever a corporation or a railway company sought to acquire land for any purpose the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act came into operation and said they must take the whole and not part of the property of the individual whose land they sought to acquire. It appeared to him that the Post Office was just about the last public department that should seek to take advantage of any private owner of property. If the Post Office took property for public purposes it should be bound by the general law of the land and be compelled, if the owner wished it, to take the whole of the particular property and pay a fair market price for it. He objected to the Post Office being relieved from the obligation of the general law under Section 92 of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act of 1845.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he thought in all previous Bills of this description the clause had been inserted, and there was no dispute between the owner and the Post Office in this case.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that Section 92 of the Lands Clauses Act simply provided that the owner, part of whose property was taken, could demand that the whole should be taken, and if there were no complaint there was no reason why the general law should be departed from.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said there were difficulties with regard to title.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD thought the right hon. Gentleman must have been misinstructed in regard to this matter, because if there were difficulties with regard to title they were dealt with in the earlier clauses of the Bill. This was not a question of title, but whether the Post Office was to take a piece of land instead of the whole. A question of the title of a piece was the same as a question of the title of the whole.

SIR E. CARSON (Dublin University) thought that the right hon. Gentleman must be mistaken in saying that this concerned questions of title, which were regulated in quite a different way.

SIR FREDERICK BANBURY (City of London) said the Postmaster-General had made two replies. One was that this clause was introduced because it was a question of title, and the other was that there was no dispute. He submitted that if there was no dispute there was no necessity to introduce the clause which did not in any way solve any dispute that might arise out of the title. He would tell the right hon. Gentleman why the clause was introduced. It was introduced in order to save the Post Office money, because they thought, and rightly from their point of view, that it would be cheaper to buy part of the property when they only required part than to buy the whole. From the point of view of the Post Office that was a good object no doubt, but from the point of view of the individual holder of property it was exceedingly bad. He suggested to the right hon. Gntleman that the best thing for him to do was to report progress, and he moved accordingly.

THE CHAIRMAN said he could not accept the Motion.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said there was nothing new about the clause, and no one would suffer by it. The whole of the property in question was not required by the Post Office and it was only proposed to take a portion of it. They could not, however, take it if material detriment was caused to the whole. That point was left to the arbitrator, but there was nothing new about the clause. In many of these cases there were difficulties in regard to various interests of owners and the question of title had to be cleared up.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) appealed to the Attorney-General to give the Committee some advice on the legal point that had been raised.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) said he had been taken by surprise and had had only a slight opportunity of reading the section. But there would not be any difficulty in dealing with the clause. It frequently happened in the compulsory purchase of land under the Land Clauses Act that the undertakers wished to take a portion of a section of land which could not be severed without damage to the remaining portion. The landowner then had the right to insist upon the whole being taken, and that was often felt to be a hardship upon the undertakers, who contested the question whether or not the remainder would in fact be damaged by the severance. This clause provided that where the Postmaster-General only wanted a portion of land, and where the landowner insisted that the whole should be taken, the question whether the remainder which was not taken was in point of fact damaged by the severance, was left to the arbitrator.

SIR E. CARSON agreed with every word the hon. and learned Gentleman had said, but asked if he would tell them what the question of title had to do with the clause.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he apologised if, as a layman, he had made a mistake in a legal technicality.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said the observations of the Attorney-General would be very much to the point if it were proposed to make this the law of the land; but Section 92 of the Land Clauses Consolidation Act of 1845 still remained the law of the land. Why should the Post Office enjoy an exception from it? If it were a proper amendment of the law, why not make it general? Section 92 of the Land Clauses Consolidation Act provided that in all cases——

THE CHAIRMAN said this was that fourth time the hon. Gentleman had said so, and he must remind him that he was guilty of repetition.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he had never been allowed to complete the sentence yet. A Member should not be bullied in this way. He was entitled, at all events, to complete a sentence, and he proposed to begin it again and complete it.

THE CHAIRMAN said he had already told the hon. Gentleman that that was a repetition of what he had said, and he must not defy the Chair by repeating that sentence.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD: If you say you cannot permit me to finish a sentence which I have several times begun, well, then, Sir, I cannot submit to it.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must not address the Chair in that way.

SIR E. CARSON said that this was a serious and unusual clause. If there were precedents for it, they should be cited.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not find himself in agreement with his hon. friend behind him on this occasion. He supposed that the Bill was drawn in accordance with precedent, but the Committee had not got that assurance from the Government. His impression was drawn from the fact that this Bill was substantially the one introduced last session, and which was then objected to by hon. Gentlemen who were now so desirous of seeing it passed. It was owing to their opposition alone that it now required to be passed. Had they shown on that occasion the unanimous enthusiasm with which the Committee were now blessed none of this difficulty would have arisen. He suspected that the Bill was correctly drawn, and that it should be passed in the form in which the Government had brought it in. The clause seemed to him to be substantially fair, and probably it would do adequate justice to the owners of the property. The question whether this was or was not the first time that a modification of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Act had been brought in was an important one. If it was not the first time then this Bill was according to precedent, and it seemed to him that the Committee would be well advised to pass it into law. Speaking from experience he could assure hon. Gentlemen opposite that nothing was gained by allowing the debates to get heated. There was a great deal of other Government business to get through, and it could not be got through in a House where there was much heat. He would suggest that a courteous hearing should be given to objectors, and above all that the Government should give an adequate defence of the Bill.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said he had not previous Acts before him, but he was confident that this Bill was drawn in accordance with precedent in the matter.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Is it framed on the old precedent?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: As far as I know it has been.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR said he would take the hon. Gentleman's word for it.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time to-morrow.

ISLE OF MAN (CUSTOMS) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Amendment proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. CLAUDE HAY said the Bill of last year was opposed by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, and, he thought, by the present Chairman of Committees. That being so, they were entitled to a full explanation of why they now thought fit to ask the House to give it a Second Reading. He was aware that this Bill differed in certain particulars from that of last year, but nevertheless the principle was absolutely the same.

Mr. McKENNA said there had been no change in their views on this point. Last year the question which was raised caused a considerable discussion at the time.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: I think the hon. Member will find that he is referring to the year before last.

Mr. McKENNA thought the hon. Gentleman was wrong. As a matter of fact the controversy no longer existed owing to the change which had been made by last year's Bill. The present Bill was very simple. The hon. Gentleman knew that there had been a reduction in the tea duty. The Tynwald Court had by resolution made a similar reduction. What was proposed by the Bill was simply to make the reduction in the Isle of Man the same as in this country.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a Second time, and committed for to-morrow.

MUSICAL COPYRIGHT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1:—

*Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.) hoped the Committee would permit him briefly to make one or two general observations before he moved the Amendment he had on the paper. [Cries of "Order" and "Chair."]

*The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member can only speak to his Amendment.

MR. BYLES said the Committee would remember that the hon. Member in charge of the Bill had risen night after night and cast certain reflections upon the opponents of the Bill, and that they had no opportunity of replying.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must move his Amendment.

*MR. BYLES said he was only excusing himself for not having replied before. He wished to move to insert words which would provide that unless a person knew that he was committing an illegal act he should not be penalised. He had always regarded it as a principle of English law that a man must be considered innocent unless it was proved to the contrary. The Bill proposed to reverse that.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 6, after the words last inserted, to insert the words 'which he knows to be pirated.'"—(*Mr. Byles.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) supported the Amendment. He objected to this interference with criminal law being made upon the initiative of private Members. It was a very serious step to take against persons belonging to the poorest and least educated class to put them in the dock and say, "we assume you guilty unless you prove your innocence." That was the essence of the Bill. The present was the fourth Bill which had been introduced on this subject, but it was the first which had contained this clause. On a previous occasion a Grand Committee had unanimously struck out the provision. They were asked to stretch the principles of English criminal law, which they ought not to do unless for very good reasons shown, and they were asked to do so in the interests of a trade which was in the hands of a syndicate. ["No."] Oh, yes, it was; and unless they were careful they would take from the English public the supply of cheap music. ["How about the composer?"] He did not object to the interests of the composer being guarded, but he objected to attempts to stifle discussion. If the Government were prepared to say that they would be responsible and if they recommended the House to make this departure, he would say no more. The real person who should be struck at was the producer of the pirated music and not the hawker, but if a Liberal Government were prepared to take upon themselves the responsibility for this interference with individual freedom, Liberals like himself would sit still.

*THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.) said the objections of hon. Members seemed to be to matters rather of form than of substance. He would remind the Committee of the exact scope of this proposal. The Bill provided that if a man was found in possession of property which should upon examination evidence that it was of a pirated character, he should be called upon to explain how that property came into his possession, and if that explanation was unsatisfactory, and if he failed to remove the natural suspicion which his conduct aroused, he could not complain if penalties were inflicted upon him. The Bill was exceptional, but the circumstances were exceptional, and analogies for this kind of treatment were to be found in the Acts dealing with the possession of stolen property, in the Food and Drugs Act, the Merchandise Marks Act, and other Acts where the onus was thrown upon the defendant of explaining his position. If in this case the hawker proved that he was ignorant of the character of the music then his explanation would be accepted under the Bill. Appeal was made to the general principles of law, but there was a very strong recommendation of the Committee to the effect that as a prisoner could now give evidence on his own behalf, and as it was open to him to prove whether he was innocent or not, and the way in which the property came to be in his possession, the burden of proof that he did not know that the music was pirated and could not with reasonable care have ascertained that the music was pirated should rest upon the accused. The conclusion of the Committee was affirmed by two London police magistrates, Mr. Rose and Mr. Dickinson, and also endorsed by Sir Harry Poland, who was an expert in criminal law and a great stickler in regard to all matters of criminal jurisprudence.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said the Attorney-General started by saying that the Bill was an exceptional one and wound up by saying that it was in accordance with general law. He did not see how those statements could be reconciled. The hon. and learned Gentleman talked about stolen property, but this was not a case of that sort. Let them take the case of a patent; the patentee or those interested had to pay so much to the Government and spend thousands of pounds in developing the invention, and yet in that case there was no criminal remedy against an infringer, but only a civil remedy. Hon. Members had said that there was no difficulty in enforcing the law against those who were guilty of selling pirated music. If so what was the use of passing this Bill? A great deal of music was registered as copyright which was not copyright. What they did was to apprehend a hawker for selling pirated music and before the case came on go down and register the piece of music at Stationers Hall. That should have been done before. He had been told by hon. Members that if a man got hold of a piece of music which had not the publisher's name on it the music was pirated. He tested that by going to a stall, and the first piece of music he purchased, and he purchased it for 2d., was "Kathleen Mavourneen." If hon. Members would look at the piece of music which he held in his hand they would find it had not the publisher's name on it, neither was it copyright. It was sung when he was a child and its composer was long since dead. There was nothing to prove whether that was copyright or not, and yet the poor man who was taken up had the onus put upon him to prove that it was not.

Mr. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.) supported the Amendment. He said the clause was one he had always taken exception to. He suggested that the Amendment was one of substance and that the Committee had not had adequate time to discuss it. On the whole he was in favour of the Bill, but his view was that the onus of proof should be on the prosecutor. If a charge was brought against a man it was the duty of the prosecutor to establish the offence and not the accused person's duty to establish his innocence. It seemed to him that the Government were taking rather an extraordinary line with regard to the Bill. Three years ago it was introduced by Mr. Galloway and was sent to the Grand Committee on Law. The words now objected to were in the Bill, and after full consideration the Grand Committee came to the conclusion that they ought to be struck out and that the onus of proof should remain on the prosecutor. That Bill was defeated. The late Government then introduced a Bill and accepted loyally the decisions which the Committee upstairs came to. They assumed that the Committee upstairs had gone carefully and fully into the matter, and that their deliberations were of some value. The Bill, which provided that the onus should be on the prosecution was not proceeded with because of lack of time. Then the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool introduced a Bill this session, incorporating all the objectionable features that the Committee upstairs had struck out of the previous Bill. The penal clauses were much more severe, the right of appeal to quarter sessions was absolutely taken away, and the onus of proof was thrown on the prisoner. If the Bill was going to be in the stringent form in which it was now it was much more important that the onus should be on the prosecution. Why should not the prosecution have to establish the guilt of a prisoner in the same way as in all other cases? In the case of a man charged with receiving stolen goods it had to be shown, not only that the goods in his possession were stolen, but that he well knew them to have been stolen. Why should not the same provision be made in regard to pirated music? He was not at all satisfied with the argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman that any man who had pirated music in his possession would know it, or he could go into the witness box and establish his innocence. The hon. and learned Gentleman had referred to the fact that some of the magistrates had given evidence in favour of such a Bill. That evidence, however, did not amount to very much. He agreed that Mr. Rose was a great authority, and if he had made any emphatic statement upon the subject it would influence his view; but the question—a very leading one—put to Mr. Rose, was, "What do you say with regard to that?" So far as he understood, the Departmental Committee had got a copy of the Bill which was introduced in the House of Lords containing this clause, and they put it in the hands of the witnesses, who were asked their opinion about it. Mr. Rose replied—

> "I think that under the circumstances the onus of satisfying the court could be put upon him without any great injustice."

He asked any fair-minded man whether that statement of Mr. Rose's entitled him to be called as a witness in support of this contention.

SIR JOHN WALTON: Read on.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN said the next question put to Mr. Rose was, "Do you think it is desirable that the onus should be put upon him?" and the answer was "Yes." He was not saying that the gentlemen who signed the Report were guilty of so distorting Mr. Rose's evidence as to attribute to him something he did not say, but he was showing the weakness of the evidence in support. It was said that various other authorities were in favour of it, and very likely they were. Sir Harry Poland was a great authority, but he seemed to have a weakness for wishing to throw the onus on to the prisoner rather than on the prosecution. Sir Harry Poland was entitled to hold the views he did, but although he would take his opinion with regard to most questions in criminal matters he declined to accept it in reference to this matter. The Committee would be making a mistake if they refused to accept the Amendment of his hon. friend. If they relaxed this principle of requiring the prosecution to establish the guilt of the prisoner in these small matters, the tendency would be to drift in that direction in larger matters.

*MR. BERTRAM (Hertfordshire, Hitchin) thought the consideration of this Amendment might be combined with the consideration of another Amendment standing in the name of the Home Secretary which he understood would be accepted and which would make a substantial difference in the treatment which would be meted out to these hawkers of pirated music when charged with the offence. As the clause was drawn a hawker was liable even on a first conviction to imprisonment, but the Home Secretary's Amendment substituted a fine for a first offence. It was very plain that the man who was found in possession of pirated music knew it was not honestly come by. There could be no question of piracy in the case of "Kathleen Mavourneen," the copyright of which expired years ago. He thought it would make very little difference in most courts of justice whether the words of the Amendment were inserted or not. He did not believe any substantial injustice would be done to hawkers, because there would be a certain amount of sympathy on the part of magistrates, who must feel that they had not got hold of the real offender. At the same time it was plain that the vendor of pirated music must of necessity make his purchase under circumstances which ought to put him upon suspicion, and although they could not get hold of the real offender they were anxious to give to musical composers the only protection which was possible.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S. E.) supported the Amendment. He could not understand how any hon. Member who knew the effect of exceptional legislation in Ireland could propose it under this Bill. In Ireland every man on his trial was considered to be guilty before he stood in the dock. This Bill proposed exceptional legislation against the poorest of the poor, men who sometimes could not read the very name of the song they were trying to sell. A man might be deprived of making an honest living because he was afraid to sell a piece of music on which there was no publisher's name. They were dealing with men who were incapable of defending themselves and could not afford to employ solicitors. They were beginning on the lowest rung of the ladder and letting the real culprits off.

*MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire) said he should like to support this Amendment because it seemed to him that this was emphatically a case in which they ought to follow the ordinary rule of criminal law, that it ought not to be for the accused person to prove his innocence, but for the prosecution to prove his guilt. In his opinion there ought also to be an express provision requiring the prosecution to prove that the music was copyright, and that it had been registered as copyright before the alleged offence was committed.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said he had not opposed this Bill up to the present stage. This was a clause in regard to which there had been no Second Reading debate, and there had been no defence of it except by the Attorney-General. He should like to know from the head of the Government whether they were to be advised to pass this exceptional law whereby in future a citizen would be adjudged guilty unless he could prove his innocence. That was an exceedingly serious matter. He was surprised to find some of the representatives of Ireland supporting that proposal in view of what their country had suffered under exceptional laws. The Attorney-General's speech was very half-hearted; he was apparently speaking from a brief. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that the same sort of law existed with regard to the adulteration of food. Evidently he knew nothing at all about that, for, as a matter of fact, the vendor of adulterated food had to be proved guilty. He should like to hear from the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Liberal Government were going to take the responsibility of introducing a law into this country whereby an innocent man charged with an offence would have to prove his innocence. Even the Tory Party last year, wicked and bad as they were, did not dare to propose any such proceedings. Were Liberals going to be worse than Tories? God forbid that he should see anything of the sort.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said the objection to the clause as it stood was that it might operate harshly towards hawkers who were unconsciously selling pirated music. He asked the Home Secretary whether some distinction could not be drawn between the producer and the seller. If that could be done the objection to the clause would be removed. He spoke as one of the backers of the Bill, but his sympathies were altogether with this Amendment.

THE HOME SECRETARY (MR. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.) said he was unable to accept the Amendment. It would greatly weaken the effect of the Bill. It was in this matter as in the case of coining. It was comparatively easy to lay hold of the man who passed false coin, but it was very difficult to lay hold of the man who coined it. If they exempted the hawker the difficulty of dealing with piracy would be greatly increased. It was well known that a regular business in pirated music had grown up in the last year or two. It was confined to a certain class, and they knew perfectly well what they were doing. He felt certain that if a change was made in the law the offenders would disappear.

*MR. BYLES said that after the explanation given by the Government he must divide the Committee. He thought the defence of the clause as it stood was so extraordinarily weak as to constitute an argument in favour of the Amendment. The hon. and learned Gentleman began by saying that every piece of pirated music had evidence of piracy stamped upon it, and then he turned round and said there was no stamp at all. But he admitted in his next sentence that the clause was exceptional—that unless a man could prove that he was innocent he was guilty. The Attorney-General had said there were two precedents for this, one of them being the Adulteration Act. ["Divide."] If that was so then for God's sake let them not establish another precedent. ["Divide."] Or he would say with a great literary authority that "the law is a Hass." ["Divide."] He proposed to take this one division so far as he was concerned. He wished to say that he had as much sympathy with the suffering composer under the present law as any Gentlemen around him, but there was one thing he would not consent to, even if he stood alone in the House of Commons, and that was to menace the liberties which had been fought for and won by our forefathers. [Ironical cheers.] That was not nonsense. If hon. Members would read their own history they would find that former Parliaments, even centuries ago, had been ready to defend those liberties which were attacked in this Bill. He appealed to those who represented labour — pure labour — to defend the principle that a man should not be put into the dock to prove that he was innocent.

MR. O'HARE (Monaghan, N.) said he regretted exceedingly to differ from some of his colleagues on this question. He considered that, notwithstanding all the strong speeches they had heard, a sufficient case had not been made out to justify drastic legislation of this kind. If this legislation did not apply to Ireland he would give no opposition to its applying to England, Scotland, and Wales. But unfortunately it did apply to Ireland. According to the common law of the country the Crown was under the necessity of setting up a case that the man charged with an offence was likely to be proved guilty; but according to this Bill a man was compelled to prove his innocence before any man had established his right to the copyright of certain pieces of music. He contended that the general feeling was that nineteen persons charged with an offence should escape rather than that one innocent person should be convicted.

MR. LYELL (Dorsetshire, E.) said he thought a way out of the difficulty would be to put in some words providing that a man would be prosecuted if he sold music without the authority of the composer or the publisher.

Question put.

The Committee divided; Ayes 71; Noes 213. (Division List, No. 220.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Barnes, G. N.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth
Crean, Eugene
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil
Haslam, James (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Hyde, Clarendon
Jowett, F. W.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Levy, Maurice
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Seddon, J.
Summerbell, T.
Walsh, Stephen
Watt, H. Anderson
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D(Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath. North)
Wilkie, Alexander
William J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Byles and Mr. Harwood.

NOES.

Abraham, William(Cork,N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlexF.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Armitage, R.
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO
Astbury, John Meir
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)

Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'tHamlets, S. Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Causton. Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex E. Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Findlay, Alexander
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Gulland, John W.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon.. S.)
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset N
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mond, A.
Mooney, J, J.
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Paul, Herbert
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smiht, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulhp (Chesh.
Starkey, John R.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sullivan, Donal
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, W. F.
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthn
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersfd
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 7, leave out the words, 'that he acted innocently,' and to insert the words, 'as to any pirated copies that he had taken reasonable steps to ascertain whether the said copies were pirated, and did in fact believe that they were not pirated, and as to any plates that he had taken reasonable steps to ascertain whether the said plates were intended to be used for the purpose of printing or reproducing pirated copies, and did in fact believe that they were not intended for that purpose.' "—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part."

MR. LUPTON said the Amendment appeared to him to make the Bill worse than before. They first put a man in the dock and then made their case out of his mouth. In the debate just concluded the Committee had discussed the question of the accused man having to prove his innocence, but by this Amendment not only was the onus of proving his innocence placed upon the accused man, but he had to take a particular course, he had to prove that he had taken reasonable steps to ascertain whether the said copies were pirated.

SIR JOHN WALTON suggested that the Amendment should be withdrawn. He pointed out that they had discussed whether the onus should be cast on the person prosecuted, that he should prove that he "obtained it innocently" and those words covered every conceivable case.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said he would certainly withdraw the Amendment on the suggestion of the hon. and learned Gentleman.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LUPTON said the great difficulty in this case was to know who was the owner of the copyright. He thought that should be ascertained before the prosecution was started. This Bill gave the owner of a musical copyright an extremely drastic method of procedure, and therefore he thought they should provide, as he did by his Amendment, an authorised prosecutor. The promoters of this Bill only desired to get the best price for the music. It was not in the interest of the composers as had been suggested, otherwise the promoters would have agreed to his suggestion that they should put in a clause that there should be no prosecution unless it was proved that the composer was getting something out of the music. When such drastic methods of procedure were allowed to the owners of copyright the public should also be protected.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR, on a point of order, said the hon. Gentleman for the last ten minutes had been discussing everything but the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Gentleman was certainly not in order in discussing the question of the price of music.

MR. LUPTON said he would conclude by saying that this drastic criminal procedure should only be applied when there was an authorised prosecutor to conduct the prosecution.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 8 and 9, to leave out from the word 'conviction,' to end of line 9, and to insert the words 'if the prosecution is instituted by an authorised prosecutor.' "—(*Mr. Lupton.*)

Question proposed, "That words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. GLADSTONE said the Amendment he had put on the paper showed that he was in favour of the first part of the hon. Gentleman's Amendment, He was opposed to the latter part, which he thought was quite unnecessary. It was necessary, however, to leave out the words he proposed to leave out because they included the Channel Islands, which were not included in the existing Act, and therefore they made nonsense of the Bill. Another reason was that the Government's relations with the Channel Islands were of a somewhat delicate nature, and it was customary in such cases to refer the matter to them.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Question, "That the words 'if the prosecution is instituted by an authorised prosecutor' be there inserted," put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 10 and 11, to leave out the words, 'imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for a term not exceeding one month, or to.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and negatived.

Mr. LUPTON moved an Amendment with the object of making the penalty, he said, fit the offence. To summon a hawker and fine him £5 was tantamount to sending him to gaol, because he would be unable to pay the fine. If the maximum as he proposed were £1 and 2s. for each copy over ten copies, and £5 for each plate in respect of which the offence was committed, the Bill would be a little more reasonable. The fines he proposed would be quite sufficient to prevent a repetition of the offence, it would make conviction much easier, and cause a great deal less hardship.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out from beginning of line to the word 'Any,' in line 14, and to insert the words, 'not exceeding one pound and two shillings for each copy over ten copies, and five pounds for each plate in respect of which the offence is committed.'"—(*Mr. Lupton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

Mr. GLADSTONE said he thought the Bill as it stood was much better.

Mr. LUPTON said it seemed a most abominable law to pass. He little expected that the Ministerial side of the House would have been in favour of such drastic laws. He sincerely hoped the Committee would not pass a clause imposing a penalty of two months imprisonment for selling a piece of music. The selling of a piece of music was not a bad thing in itself, but was a good and meritorious act.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) moved to leave out from "pounds" in line 14 to the end of the clause. He was in favour of the Bill so far as it was for the protection of musical composers. He was only sorry they were by this Bill getting at the poor people who were trying to make a living, perhaps with a very inaccurate knowledge of the subject. It was a very tall order to say that a man was to be taken into custody without any warrant if he happened to have in his possession in a public place any pirated music at all. They would not be punishing the real offenders. He protested strongly against the principle in this clause, and it would be perfectly inconsistent, after having struck out the possibility of imprisonment for the first offence, to leave in the words he asked the Committee to reject.

***Mr. J. D. WHITE** seconded the Amendment. He considered that the proposal for arrest without warrant was quite unjustified. There was no provision that the copyright should be registered, and even if there were, a great many bogus copyrights had been registered. How could a constable form an opinion as to whether a given piece of music was copyright or not? If there was to be any such provision as these words proposed, he would make two suggestions. In the first place there should be proof that the copyright had been registered, and, secondly, there should be a request by the owner of the copyright that the alleged offender should be taken into custody, so that if the arrest had been wrongful, the man who had been wrongfully arrested should have every facility for obtaining damages from the person who had abused the law.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 14, to leave out from the word 'pounds' to end of clause."—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

***Sir JOHN WALTON** said that it appeared to him that a hawker was a person whom it would be difficult to arrest unless they gave some discretion to the constable to take him into custody. If the aggrieved person had to apply to the magistrate for a summons, and had then to return to the place where he last saw the hawker, he might find that the hawker had gone away. The figures before the Committee showed how difficult it was under the legislation of 1902 even to serve the first process in the step by which a conviction was sought to be secured.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said there were 5,000 or 6,000 summonses taken out by the Musical Copyright Association and only 278 were served.

*SIR JOHN WALTON said those engaged in the trade were perfectly well aware of the character of the music they were selling. They were persons against whom no civil proceedings could be brought. [AN HON. MEMBER: Deal with their licences.] They had no licences, and the only way of making criminal proceedings effectual was to give the constable in this case the discretion, which he already possessed under various Acts of Parliament, to arrest without warrant. If a hawker were asked to go to the police station and if he could show to the inspector that he was a respectable man, and had a good answer to the charge, he did not think he would be detained in custody. He, therefore, trusted the Committee would refuse the Amendment.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The "Ayes" have it. [Some HON. MEMBERS: The Noes have it.]

THE CHAIRMAN called upon the Home Secretary to move the next Amendment. [Renewed cries of "The Noes have it.]

*THE CHAIRMAN said he had declared "The Ayes have it," and he was really very sorry that he did not hear the cries of "The Noes have it."

MR. SAMUEL EVANS said he heard the cries.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) said he also heard the cries.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am not disputing in any way that there were cries. What I said was that the cries did not reach me nor, I may add, those sitting near me.

MR. CREAN moved to report progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Crean.*)

MR. GLADSTONE appealed to the hon. Member not to press the Motion.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 45; Noes, 191. (Division List, No. 221.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlexF.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brace, William
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Delany, William
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Evans, Samuel T.
Forster, Henry William
Hardie,J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seddon, J.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool,Walton
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Valentia, Viscount
Watt, H. Anderson
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Crean and Mr. Patrick White.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Armitage, R.
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Astbury, John Meir
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, Hubert (Eastbourne
Beaumont. W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'wr Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Branch, James
Brooke, Stopford
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinstd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Courthope, J. Loyd
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazelton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r)
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Major B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. F. Lyulph (Chesh.
Starkey, John R.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Wedgwood, Josiah F.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon,
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 16, after the word 'who,' to insert the words 'in any street or public place.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

THE CHAIRMAN named Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Joseph Pease as Tellers for the Ayes; but no Member being willing to act as Teller for the Noes, the Chairman declared the Ayes had it.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS moved to insert after the Home Secretary's Amendment the word "knowingly." A person should not be convicted, in his judgment, unless he knowingly committed an offence.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 17, after the words last inserted, to insert the word 'knowingly.'"—(*Mr. Samuel Evans.*)

Question put, "That the word 'knowingly' be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 40; Noes, 190. (Division List No. 222.)

AYES.

Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Branch, James
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Everett, R. Lacey
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hodge, John
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Murphy, John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pollard, Dr.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Ridsdale, E. E.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Seddon, J.
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Samuel Evans and Mr. Arthur Henderson.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlexF.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Armitage, R.
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Astbury, John Meir
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont,Hubert(Eastbourne
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'wrHamlets,S.Geo.)
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Brace, William
Brigg, John
Brooke, Stopford
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bryce, J.A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Cairns, Thomas
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen(Renfrew,W.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinstd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, W.)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, RtHn.HerbertJohn
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh N. (Donegal, W.)
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J.M(FalkirkB'ghs)
Maclean, Donald

MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Morse, L. L.
Newnes, A. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil Williams
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Paul, Herbert
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Chas. H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Sir G.Scott(Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H.(Ashton underLyne
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seely, Major J. B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool,Walton
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.
Starkey, John R.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Sir Edw. (Salisbury)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Watt, H. Anderson
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Younger, George.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 17, to leave out the words 'pirated music,' and insert the words 'such copies as aforesaid.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Proposed words inserted.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 205; Noes, 22. (Division List No. 223.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Armitage, R.
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Astbury, John Meir
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn, Sir J.Williams(Devonp't
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brooke, Stopford
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Cairns, Thomas
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Coats, SirT. Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay(Galway
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Frank (Radnor
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Forster, Henry William
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn. Herbert J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J.Keir(MerthyrTydvil)
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon., S.)

Hervey, F.W.F.(BurySEdm'ds)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred J. (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S)
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mond, A.
Montague, E. S.
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robers (Staffs, Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinbugh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Chas. H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, SirG.Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A.H.(Ashton under Lyne)
Seely, Major J. B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Starkey, John R.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Walton, Sir J. L. (Leeds, S.)
Watt, H. Anderson
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.D.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.D.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES — Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Cooper, G. J.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Delany, William
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Hodge, John
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lupton, Arnold
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Mara, James
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Seddon, J.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Crean and Mr. Patrick White.

Clause 2:—

MR. GLADSTONE said he had a number of Amendments to the clause on the Paper and he would state their general purport to the Committee. The clause dealt with the question of search warrants, and in the opinion of the Government it was too drastic. All the Amendments standing in his name must be taken together. The object was to prevent a constable from entering premises by force without a search warrant properly granted. In the second place the Amendment would allow a constable who had a search warrant to seize any pirated music found on the premises, and he was not confined to those pieces which might be specified. The Act as it stood enabled a constable to break into a house and seize the pirated copies of a particular piece of music without a search warrant, but the seizure was restricted to the copies of that specified piece.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 18, to leave out the words 'Any constable authorised by an order of,' and insert the word 'if.'"—(*Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. O'HARE said the fragmentary way in which the Amendments appeared gave the Committee no idea of what actually was going to be the effect of the Amendments. He did not think it was fair to ask them to approve of a clause as to which they had no exact indication of the effect it might have upon the unfortunate people who might come within its meshes. On these grounds he would ask to report progress.

THE CHAIRMAN said he could not reasonably accept the Motion after so recent a division upon a similar Motion.

MR. CREAN said these appeared to be rather drastic Amendments tacked on to a most drastic clause. The first clause was bad and was not much improved by the Amendments inserted. It was impossible to realise what the effect of Clause 2 would be. They were asked to swallow this gilded pill, and the gilt that was put on might be worse than the ingredients. Would the Secretary of State for the Home Department explain what the effect of the clause with the Amendments would be?

MR. GLADSTONE read the clause in the form in which he proposed to amend it.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause," put, and negatived.

Proposed word "if" inserted.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 19, leave out the words from 'jurisdiction,' to 'between,' in line 21, and insert the words 'is satisfied by information on oath that there is reasonable ground for suspecting that an offence against this Act is being committed on any premises, the court may grant a search warrant authorising the constable named therein to enter the premises.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, lines 22 and 23, to leave out the words 'enter any house or place named in such order.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 23, after the word 'necessary' to insert 'to.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'to' be there inserted."

MR. O'HARE said an Amendment in his name had priority, and he desired to ask the Chairman whether each Member had not an equal right in this House.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he had not examined whether the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman could have been proposed, but he thought the Amendments of the Secretary of State were generally accepted, and that all the other Amendments would not be moved. In any case he had passed the point of the hon. Gentleman's Amendment and he could not go back to it now.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 25, after the word 'otherwise,' to insert the words 'and to seize any copies of any musical work or any plates in respect of which he has reasonable ground for suspecting that an offence against this Act is being committed.

(2) All copies of any musical work and plates seized under this section shall be brought before a court of summary jurisdiction, and if proved to be pirated copies or plates intended to be used for the printing or reproduction of pirated copies shall be forfeited and destroyed or otherwise dealt with as the court think fit.'"—(*Mr. Gladstone.*)

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 216; Noes, 3. (Division List No. 224.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Acland-Hood, RtHn. Sir Alex. F
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Armitage, R.
Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hn. Hugh O.
Balcarres, Lord.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barron, Rowland Hirst
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beaumont, W. C. B. (Hexham)
Benn, Sir J Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Black, Alexander Wm. (Banff)
Boland, John
Bowles, G. Stewart
Brace, William
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brooke, Stopford
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bryce, J. A. (Inverness Burghs)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard
Clough, W.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, CH (Sussex, E Grinst'd.)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crombie, John William
Crossley, William J.
Cullinan, J.
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Chas. Ramsay (Galway
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Maj. E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey

Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Forster Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gulland, John W.
Halpin, J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon. S.)
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mond, A.

Montagu, E. S.
Morse, L. L.
Murphy, John
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncaster
Norman, Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, E. E. (Edinburgh, Cen.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhamt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Chas. H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberston, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Samuel, Herbert L (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton und. Lyne)
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanley, Hn A. Lyulph (Chesh)
Starkey, John R.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Sullivan, Donal
Summerbell, T.
Tennant, Sir Edw. (Salisbury)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thompson, J. W. H. (Som'set, E.)
Tomkinson, James
Ure, Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Verney, F. W.
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Watt, H. Anderson

Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, George (Norfolk,
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan,
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'th'n)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Hay, Hon. Claude George
Lupton, Arnold
O'Hare, Patrick

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Patrick White and Mr. Crean.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3 :—

Amendments made.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR moved an Amendment to exclude appliances used for playing mechanical instruments from the expressions "pirated copies" and "plates." He said this proviso was proposed in consequence of an engagement he had made to those interested in the gramaphone and other instruments who thought that their property would be imperilled by this Bill. There was no such intention.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 4, at end, to add the words 'provided also that the expressions "pirated copies" and "plates" shall not, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to include perforated music rolls used for playing mechanical instruments, or records used for the production of sound waves, or the matrices or other appliances by which such rolls or records respectively are made.' "—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor.*)

Question put, "That these words be there added."

MR. LUPTON said it was hardly creditable to the House that they should pass a Bill which imposed penalties on certain music sellers and exempted others from the penalties.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 4 :—

MR. O'HARE moved that Clause 4 should not apply to Ireland. No evidence had been produced that there was anything of the kind referred to Ireland, He was therefore surprised that the Government wanted to apply this new crime to Ireland and to thrust into the hands of the police of Ireland the power to break open doors with a power of search and all the rest of it. He believed that if these new powers were applied to Ireland they would produce consequences greater than were intended to be removed.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said that the speech of his hon. friend did not represent the views of the majority of the Irish Members, because while the pirate musical trade was at present absent from Ireland, the consummation they were bound to wish for was that it should be avoided in their country. Therefore, if a division were taken, the immense majority of the Irish Members would vote in favour of the clause.

MR. CREAN said that the great majority of the Irish Members were opposed to anything approaching coercion in Ireland. And they objected to these additional powers being given to the police in Ireland. How many times had they come to this House and opposed the action of the police in using their weapons against the people of the country? [Ironical OPPOSITION laughter.] That might be a matter of laughter for hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House, but he would be very sorry to give more power into the hands of the police in Ireland. The Amendment proposed that Ireland should be left out of the operation of this Bill. This was not the first time that a request had been made for the exclusion of Ireland from the operation of a Bill applicable to the rest of the United Kingdom. He had no particular interest in this Bill; but what he and his friends asked for was that the Government should not give more power to the police for coercion work in Ireland. They were dealing with men who had created crimes in Ireland, and why should they give them facilities to create more crimes? [OPPOSITION cries of "Order."] He was order. Rightly or wrongly, the House would have to judge whether they took a serious view of this matter. He did not accuse the Chairman of anything worse than a lapse of memory in ruling that an Amendment previously moved was out of order.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member must not discuss the Chairman's conduct of business. The particular Amendment in question was out of order.

MR. CREAN said he was only saying that the particular Amendment was omitted by the Chairman's action, but he did not accuse him of doing it intentionally. He did not accuse the Chairman of doing anything wrong or discourteous, but they had not had the opportunity of speaking to the Amendment which was put down. He thought they were justified in asking that this Bill should not apply to Ireland.

Question put.

MR. O'HARE rose to speak; but——

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the hon. Member was not entitled to address the Committee except on a point of order, and then he must be seated.

MR. O'HARE, speaking seated and with his hat on, amidst laughter, said he hoped that hon. Members would have nothing more extraordinary to laugh at.

THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member could only speak to a point of order. What he was talking about was not a point of order.

MR. O'HARE said he begged leave to withdraw the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member need not cry "Aye" when the Amendment was put, and it would be negatived, but he could not withdraw it at that stage.

Amendment negatived.

Clause 4 agreed to.

MR. O'HARE moved the following new clause, "The Act shall not apply to any musical copyright which is not registered in terms of the Copyright Act 1842, and no proceedings shall be competent in respect of any offence committed prior to such registration." He objected to plaintiffs bringing an action and then only registering the copyright. A man should, he thought, establish a claim to copyright before he took proceedings.

New Clause—

"This Act shall not apply to any musical copyright which is not registered in terms of The Copyright Act, 1842, and no proceedings shall be competent in respect of any offence committed prior to such registration."—(*Mr. O'Hare*).

Brought up and read a first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. LUPTON thought the new clause was a reasonable one. If a man did not register his copyright at Stationer's Hall until he brought an action no opportunity was given for investigation.

*SIR JOHN WALTON said the Government had considered the suggestion and had come to the conclusion that it was unwise and unnecessary because it would cast an unnecessary burden upon the owners of this species of copyright property. Copyright in this country might be held without registration, but if proceedings were proposed to be taken it became necessary that the copyright should be put upon the register. It would put the owners of this class of copyright in a serious difficulty if the clause were adopted, and especially the owners of the copyright of foreign music. Under the Berne Convention we were bound to extend to foreigners the same copyright as they extended to us. If we insisted upon their registering all their songs and music as they wrote them, it would be held we were casting a new and unjustifiable burden upon them.

Sir John Walton.

Question put, and negatived.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 311.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at six minutes after Three o'clock a.m.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CLX.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Alkali, &c., Works	*Earl of Granard*	Committee 5th July (162)
Conveyancing [H.L.]	*Lord Davey*	Committee 5th July (162) Report 6th July (350) Read 3^a and passed 16th July (1276)
*Criminal Appeal [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Report 10th July (656) Read 3^a and passed 12th July (1002)
Ground Game [H.L.]	*Lord Burghclere*	Committee 12th July (996)
Married Women's Property [H.L.]	*Lord Davey*	Committee 5th July (163) Report 6th July (350) Read 3^o and passed 16th July (1276)
Settled Lands [H.L.]	*Lord Davey*	Committee Report } 5th July (163) Read 3^a and passed 16th July (1276)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Church Discipline	*Sir D. Brynmor Jones*	Read 1^o 6th July (423)
Cruelty to Animals (No. 2)	*Sir F. Banbury*	Read 1^o 6th July (423)
*Deanery of Manchester	*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*	Read 1^o 16th July (1360)
Dogs Protection (No. 2)	*Sir F. Banbury*	Read 1^o 6th July (424)

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Ecclesiastical Disorders (No. 2)	*Sir G. Kekewich*	Read 1° 16th July (1361)
*Education (England and Wales)	*Mr. Birrell*	Committee 4th July (64) Committee 9th ,, (535) Committee 10th ,, (941) Committee 11th ,, (900) Committee 16th ,, (1361)
*Education (Scotland) Act (1872) Amendment	*Mr. R. L. Harmsworth*	Read 1° 4th July (60)
*Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs	*Sir E. Strachey*	As amended, considered 13th July (1236)
Irish Tobacco	*Mr. W. Redmond*	Read 1° 9th July (535)
*Isle of Man (Customs)	*Mr. McKenna*	Read 2° 16th July (1451)
Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment	*Mr. Cathcart Wason*	Bill withdrawn 4th July (60)
Municipal Corporations	*Mr. Vivian*	Lords Amendments considered 12th July (1074)
*Musical Copyright	*Mr. T. P. O'Connor*	Committee 4th July (158) Committee 9th ,, (651) Committee 16th ,, (1453)
*Post Office Sites	*Mr. Buxton*	Committee 16th July (1447)
*Public Health Regulations as to Food	*Mr. John Burns*	Read 1° 11th July (900)
*Recorders, Stipendiary Magistrates, and Clerks of the Peace	*Mr. Herbert Samuel*	Read 1° 4th July (60)
*Reserve Forces	*Mr. Haldane*	Lords' Amendments considered 9th July (535)
Rights of Way (Scotland)	*Mr. Gulland*	Read 1° 4th July (60)
Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland)	*Mr. T. W. Russell*	Bill Withdrawn 6th July (423)
Town Tenants (Ireland)	*Mr. McKillop*	Committee 6th July (414)
*Wireless Telegraphy	*Mr. Buxton*	Lords' Amendments considered 13th July (1202)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1906.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

In Continuation of List given in previous Volume.

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
University College, London (Transfer) Act, 1905,—Copy of Statutes made by the University College Transfer Commissioners for regulating the Constitution and Management of (a) University College School, Hampstead, (b) the North London or University College Hospital and the School of Advanced Medical Studies connected therewith, and Orders made by the Commissioners supplemental to the above Statutes [5 Edw. VII., c. 91, s. 9 (1)]	6 July	40 days
University of London Act, 1898, and University College, London (Transfer), Act, 1905,—Copy of Statutes made by the Senate of the University of London, in pursuance of The University College, London (Transfer), Act, 1905, for the management of the University College, London, and Amendments to existing Statutes in connection therewith [61 and 62 Vic., c. 62, s. 5 (1)]	6 July	40 days
Universities (Scotland) Act, 1889 (Ordinance),—Copy of University Court Ordinance No. XVI. (Glasgow, No. 4) (Institution of a Degree in Science in Pharmacy) [52 and 53 Vic., c. 55, s. 20]	9 July	12 weeks
Prisons (England and Wales),—Copy of Draft Rules proposed to be made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department under the Prisons Acts, 1877 and 1898, with respect to the Constitution of the Visiting Committees of Bristol and Shepton Mallet Prisons [61 and 62 Vic., c. 41, s. 2]	11 July	30 sitting days
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copy of Order made by the Council of the Borough of Accrington, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain Shops within the Borough [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)]	11 July	40 days
Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888,—Copy of Order made by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, under the provisions of the said Act, for the variation of an Order for creating the Northumberland Sea Fisheries District [51 and 52 Vic., c. 54, s. 1 (4)]	16 July	30 days

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

NINTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1906.

JULY 4—*JULY* 16.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Abbeyleix

Spence, Head Constable, Inquiry into Allegations against.
  Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 52, 53.
  Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 6*, 359.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Cork Co., N.E.]

Kingston Estate—Corracunna Farm Dispute, Abolition of Police Post, etc., *July 11*, 892, 893.

Abyssinia

Railway Agreement—Progress of Negotiations as to.
  Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 5*, 225.
  Q. Mr. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 9*, 513.
  Qs. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 12*, 1053, 1054.

Accounts

Examination of Clerk of Parliaments as Witness before Select Committee—Petition Presented, *July 5*, 162.

Accrington

Shop Hours Act—Order Presented, *July 11*, 855; *July 12*, 996.

Achscrabster

Allotments, Expense involved in applying for.
  Q. Mr. R. L. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 9*, 495.

Adair Estate

Reinstatement Claim of T. Flanagan.
  Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 483.

Adkins, Mr. W. R. [Lancashire, S.E., Middleton]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 907–909, 939.

Admiralty

First Lord—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.

Financial Secretary—Rt. Hon E. Robertson.

Africa, Central

Forest Conservation, Proposals as to.
  Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 5*, 213.

Labour Recruitment in the Lake Province, Decision as to.
  Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 4*, 14.

Africa, East

See also Names of places.

British Indians, Settlement rights of.
  Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 5*, 217, 218.

Currency—Order in Council Presented, *July 5*, 334, 353.

Labour recruiting Licences issued to Persons other than the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association.
  Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1330.

[*cont.*

Africa, East—*cont.*

Legislative Council, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1327.

Lourenço Marques—Trade Report Presented, *July 12*, 995.

Africa, South

See also Names of Colonies.

Convict and Prison Labour, System of.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 10*, 706.

Cotton Goods shipped before Increase in Duty was made known, Duty Payable on.
Q. Mr. Belloc; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1331.

Customs Convention—Procedure in Ratifying New Tariff.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1048, 1049.

Garrison in

Bloemfontein Transport, Deficiencies in, alleged.
Q. Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9*, 501, 502.

Reduction, and Change in Character of—New Scheme.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1105.

Milk, Skimmed Condensed, Import Duty on—Date of bringing new Regulations into Force.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 9*, 490.

Papers on Affairs of, Date of Tabling.
Q. Mr. Lyttelton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 864.

Self-Government Proposals.
Date of Bringing into Force.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 896.

Mode of effecting, Opportunity for Discussing, etc.
Q. Sir B. Gurdon; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 9*, 482.
Q. Mr. Lyttelton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 864, 865.
Qs. Mr. Lyttelton, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 1357, 1358.

Statement, Date of making.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 12*, 1072.

White Population, Measures taken for Protection of.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1048.

Africa, West

See also Names of Places.

Portuguese Islands of S. Thomé and Principé, Allegations as to Slavery in.
Qs. Sir G. Parker; *As.* Sir E. Grey, Mr. Runciman, *July 5*, 229.

Aghanlish

M'Glone, P., Decision in Case of.
Q. Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1306.

Agricultural Organisation Society (Irish)

Amount paid to, in each Quarter, from 1st April, 1900, to 28th February, 1905, from Agricultural Department—Return Ordered, *July 16*, 1300.

Founder of, Members nominated to Agricultural Council, etc.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 498.

Grants to, by Agricultural Board.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 498.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 734, 735.

Statements as to expenditure of.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1354.

Agricultural Rates Act

Payments under, Basis of.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 9*, 496.

Agriculture

Damage done to Crops by Motor Cars.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 13*, 1234.

Instruction *see* Education (England and Wales)—Agricultural.

Railway Rates on Produce, *see under* Railways.

Report on Returns relating to Acreage and Produce of Crops and Live Stock for United Kingdom, British Possessions and Foreign Countries, Presented, *July 9*, 470, 480.

Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of

President—Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

Grants to, from the Treasury, Comparison of, with Grants to Irish Board.
Os. Mr. Barnard, *July 13*, 1233, 1234.

Representative in the House of Commons, Question as to.
Os. Mr. L. Hardy, *July 13*, 1210.

Vote for, *July 13*, 1209.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland

Experimental Farms, Profit and Loss on.
Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1354.

[*cont.*

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland—*cont.*
Grants to and work of.
Qs. Mr. Ginnell, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 41, 42.
Vote for, *July 13*, 1238.
Winter Dairying, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 47.

Aland Islands
Russian Occupation, etc., of, alleged.
Q. Mr. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 9*, 512.

Alden, Mr. P. [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Africa, South.
Customs Tariff, New, Procedure in Ratifying, *July 12*, 1048.
Self-Government Proposals—Date of bringing into force, *July 11*, 896.
Education—Medical Officers Appointed, *July 11*, 880.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1389, 1390.
Medical Inspection of Children, Proposals as to *July 9*, 523.
Epsom—Eviction of Mr. Hodson from North Tadworth Farm, *July 12*, 1065.
House of Commons Lighting, etc., Department Employees, Pension Claims of, *July 5*, 202.
Lockerbie Town Hall Bazaar, alleged Raffling at, *July 11*, 856.
Transvaal
Chinese Labourers
Crimes, Statistics as to, *July 9*, 506; *July 11*, 873.
Repatriation, Local Labour Opinion on, etc., *July 9*, 507.
Import Statistics, Returns as to, proposed, *July 12*, 1049.

Alderney
Abattoir for Reception of Live Cattle from Argentina—proposed Erection of.
Qs. Mr. Gardner, *July 13*, 1224; Sir E. Strachey, 1229, 1230.
Tabling Correspondence proposed.
Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 5*, 241.

Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Bill
c. Rep. July 12*, 1028.

Aliens Act (Amendment) Bill
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 5*, 250.

Allen, Mr. A. A. [Christchurch]
Bournemouth—*status* of Winton Post Office, *July 9*, 483.
Education Bill—Clause 4—Defraying Cost of Public Inquiry, etc., *July 10*, 708.
Finchley and Hendon, Telephone Service Exchange for, proposed, *July 11*, 856.
Opium Farming in Malay States, Singapore and Hong Kong—Revision of System proposed, *July 16*, 1326, 1327.

Allotments Act
Extension to Ireland, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1316.

Alverstone, Lord—*Lord Chief Justice.*
Criminal Appeal Bill, 3R. *July 12*, 1002–1005, 1007.

Anson, Sir W. R. [Oxford University]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 64, 65, 73, 80–82, 104, 117, 118, 120, 121, 125; *July 9*, 540, 546, 555, 557, 558, 560, 603, 604, 608, 610, 612, 616, 627–629; *July 10*, 741, 747, 753; 765, 776, 782, 806–808, 815, 818; *July 11*, 907, 929, 930, 950, 953, 954, 971; *July 16*, 1366, 1370, 1375, 1376, 1383–1386, 1405–1407, 1420, 1425, 1430.

Anstruther-Gray, Maj. [St. Andrew's Burghs]
Army—Two Battalion Regiments, Reserves of, Cost per Man, etc., *July 11*, 868.

Ardarroch
Pier, Grant for, proposed.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 11*, 859.

Arkwright, Mr. J. S. [Hereford]
Great Yarmouth Election Petition—Charges against Mr. Justice Grantham, Government Attitude, etc., *July 4*, 59.

Armagh
Locomotive Boiler Explosion Result of Inquiry into.
Q. Mr. Hudson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 9*, 519.

Armitage, Mr. R. [Leeds, Central]
Education—Teachers' Superannuation Fund, Amount to Credit of, etc., *July 10*, 709.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 946, 947.
Italian Import Duties on Machinery and Bar Iron, *July 4*, 15.

Army
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Secretary—Earl of Portsmouth.
Financial Secretary—Mr. T. R. Buchanan.
[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Artillery

Batteries, Cost of Upkeep of.
Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9*, 503, 504.

Horse Artillery—Peace, and War, Establishment, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1094.

Militia Garrison Artillery

Training Scheme for.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1093, 1094.

Utilising Services of for Ammunition Columns, proposed.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1090, 1091; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1122, 1123; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1160.

Number of, Guns required for a Battery, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1125; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1125; Sir C. Dilke, 1132, 1133.

Peace and War, Establishment—New Scheme for.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1091–1095; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1160–1161.

Reserve for, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1091, 1092; *Mr. Arnold-Forster*, 1121.

Strength of—Number of Battalions capable of Taking the Field in Fighting Strength.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1088–1089; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1121, 1122; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1160.

Terms of Service, Alteration in.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 12*, 1161.

Auxiliary Forces, *see also titles* Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry.

Cost of, Increase in during last Ten Years.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1110.

Barracks

Lichfield, Accommodation for Married Soldiers, Inadequacy of.
Os. Earl of Dartmouth, *July 9*, 476, 477; Earl of Portsmouth, 476, 477, 478.

Norwich Scheme, Decision as to.
Qs. Lord Castlereagh; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 10*, 713.

Piershill, Sanitary Condition of.
Q. Lord Turnour; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 11*, 866.

Army—*cont.*

Barracks—*cont.*

Preston—Proposals as to Repairs.
Q. Lord Turnour; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 11*, 866.

Tidworth Barracks

Hospital, Church, and Recreation Room Accommodation, Proposals as to.
Os. Earl Bathurst, *July 6*, 336, 337; Earl of Portsmouth, 337, 338, 339; Bishop of Winchester, 338; Archbishop of Canterbury, 339; Earl of Donoughmore, 339.

Lighting Arrangements.
Q. Lord Castlereagh; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 10*, 712, 713.

Canteens at Aldershot, Alleged Short Weight in Goods sold at.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1044.

Cardwell System.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 12*, 1131; Mr. Haldane, 1168, 1169.

Compulsory Military Service, *see that title.*

Contracts, *see under* War Office.

Courts Martial—Murder Trials abroad. Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Haldane *July 12*, 1037.

Defence of India, Large Number of Troops required for—Difficulty of Effecting Reductions, etc.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1082, 1083.

Defence of the Empire, *see that title.*

Efficiency, Necessity for securing.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1076, 1077, 1079.

Emergency Rations, Reason for Destroying.
Q. Mr. C. E. Price; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 4*, 13.

Executions in Public, Prohibition of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1037.

Expansion, Necessity for and proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1081, 1117, 1166; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1120, 1123; Sir J. Dickson-Poynder, 1139; Mr. A. L. Lever, 1152.

Expeditionary Force, Strength and Composition of.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1095–99; Sir C. Dilke, 1133, 1134; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1161–1163.

[cont.

Army—*cont.*

Expenditure

  Investigation into Items of, from Point of View of Efficiency.
    Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1079.

  Reduction of, Necessity for, and Proposals as to.
    Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1076; Mr. A. L. Lever, 1152; Mr. Brace, 1156.

  Total Expenditure.
    Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 12*, 1129; Sir J. Dickson-Poynder, 1140.

Guards

  Aldershot Brigade, Proposals as to.
    Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1102, 1103.

  Average Cost per Man.
    Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1103, 1104, 1170; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1121; Sir C. Dilke, 1130.
    Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9*, 502.

  Coldstream Guards—Arrangements for Despatch of Battalion to Egypt.
    Q. Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 16*, 1322, 1323.

  Cost per Battalion per Annum.
    Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9*, 503.

  Reduction in Strength of, proposals as to.
    Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1101–1104, 1140; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1120; Sir C. Dilke, 1130; Mr. G. Baring, 1138, 1139; Sir J. Dickson-Poynder, 1140; Colonel Herbert, 1148, 1149; Col. Lockwood, *July 12*, 1150, 1151; Sir C. Rasch, 1155.

  Reservists, Statistics as to.
    Q. Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9*, 502.

Health of—Reform Measures.
  Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1107–1109.

Hospital Accommodation in War, proposed Reduction of.
  Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1109.

Infantry, Supplementing from the Militia, proposals as to.
  Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 12*, 1130.

Lancers, 9th (Queen's Royal) South African Service of.
  Qs. Sir W. Evans-Gordon, Sir C. Rasch; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 5*, 209, 210.

Linked Battalion System, Defects of.
  Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 12*, 1131, 1132; Sir J. Dickson-Poynder, 1141.

Army—*cont.*

Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry, *see those titles.*

Mobilisation of in Event of War, Arrangements for.
  Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 9*, 473, 474; Earl of Portsmouth, 474, 475; Earl of Donoughmore, 476; Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1084, 1085.

  Experimental Mobilisation of one Command to test Arrangements, proposed.
    Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 9*, 473, 474, 475; Earl of Portsmouth, 474.

  Foreign Armies, Schemes for.
    Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 9*, 473.

Officers

  Shortage in, proposals as to dealing with.
    Os. Earl of Dundonald, *July 10* 668–669; Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1168.
    Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1035 1036.

  System of Education in Public Schools, Unpractical Nature of.
    Os. Earl of Dundonald, *July 10*, 669.

Ordnance Factories, Vaccination Regulations—Case of A. Handscombe.
  Q. Mr. Branch; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1036.

Oversea Requirements the determining factor as to strength required.
  Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1080, 1081, 1082.

Pensions

  Non-Commissioned Officers and Soldiers Retired during last Seven Years.
    Q. Mr. Parker; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 10*, 714, 715.

  Short Service Regulation, Date of Cancelling.
    Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 11*, 864.

Personnel

  Reduction in, Proposals as to.
    Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1085, 1096, 1099, 1100, 1104, 1106; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1120; Sir J. Dickson-Poynder, 1139–1141, 1143; Viscount Castlereagh, 1145, 1146; Sir C. Rasch, 1155; Sir H. Vincent, 1171.

    Eight Battalions, Reduction of.
      Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1087, 1096, 1104–1106.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

Personnel—cont.

Reduction in—*cont.*

Oversea Requirements the Determining Factor.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12,* 1080, 1081, 1082, 1083; Sir J. Dickson-Poynder, 1141; Col. Herbert, 1148.

Wastage, Provision for.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12,* 1098; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1124.

Promotions, Outside influence, enforcement of Order prohibiting.
Q. Mr. Paul; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 10,* 712.

Recruiting and Enlistment—Under-age Recruits, Regulations as to, Case of Mr. McGarvey.
Qs. Mr. H. Law; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *July 10,* 715, 716.

Reorganisation Proposals.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 12,* 1119–1127; Sir C. Dilke, 1127–1137; Mr. G. Baring, 1137–1139; Sir J. Dickson-Poynder, 1139–1143; Viscount Castlereagh, 1143–1146; Colonel Herbert, 1147–1150; Colonel Lockwood, 1150–1151; Mr. A. L. Lever, 1151–1154; Sir C. Rasch, 1155; Mr. Brace, 1156; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1157–1164; Major Seely, 1164, 1165.

Brodrick's, Mr., Attack on.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12,* 1075.

Opportunity for Adequate Discussion of, Prior to carrying into effect.
Os. Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 12,* 1119; Sir C. Dilke, 1127, 1136; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1157; Mr. Haldane, 1166, 1167; Sir H. Vincent, 1171; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13,* 1192–1194, 1197, 1198, 1199; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1192, 1193, 1197, 1198; Mr. Asquith, 1199, 1200; Mr. Arnold-Forster 1200; Sir H. Vincent, 1201; Sir F. Banbury, 1201.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 9,* 530.

Statement (Mr. Haldane), *July 12,* 1075–1119, 1165–1171.

Reserve

Officers called up for Service during South African War—Inquiry into Grievances of, proposed.
Os. Lord Rosmead, *July 9,* 471, 472; Earl of Portsmouth, 472, 473.

Army—*cont.*

Reserve—*cont.*

Strengthening, Necessity for.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10,* 657, 666; Earl of Dundonald, 667, 670.

Route March of Buffs on 10th and 11th April, Casualties during.
Q. Mr. L. Jones; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9,* 500, 501.

Separation of Indian Army from Home Army, proposed.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 12,* 1130.

Shortage, Automatic, During next Six Years.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 10,* 713, 714.

Six Big Divisions of Infantry with Four Cavalry Brigades and Full Artillery, proposed.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12,* 1086.

Soldiers, Employment for, on Expiration of Service—Proposals as to Teaching of Trades, etc.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12,* 1167.

Report of Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, Presented, *July 9,* 480; *July 10,* 655.

Sparkbrook Factory

Proposals for Allocating Orders to.
Q. Mr. Branch; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 11,* 866.

Sale of—Date of Commencing Negotiations.
Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 16,* 1321, 1322.

Statement of Policy (Mr. Haldane), *July 12,* 1075–1119.

Terms of Enlistment

Cardwell Scheme.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 12,* 1131.

New Proposals.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12,* 1106; Sir C. Dilke, 1130, 1131.

Three years' Service Experiment, Failure of.
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 10,* 674; Mr. Haldane, *July 12,* 1100.

Two-Battalion Regiments, Reserves of, Cost per Man, etc.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 11,* 868.

University Candidates, Revision of Regulations as to, proposed.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July* 11, 867.

War Office, *see that title.*

Army Estimates
- Barrack Construction, etc.—£2,353,000, *Rep.* July 13*, 1239.
- Civil Superannuation and Gratuities and Payments under Workmen's Compensation Act—£180,000, *Rep.* July 13*, 1240.
- Educational Establishments — £132,000, *Rep.* July 13*, 1239.
- Hospitals, etc.—£1,684,000, *Rep.* July 13*, 1239.
- Miscellaneous Effective Services—£77,000, *Rep.* July 13*, 1239.
- Ordnance Department—£775,000, *Rep.* July 13*, 1239.
- Quarterings, Transport and Remounts—£2,111,000, *Rep.* July 3*, 1238.
- Repair of Armaments and Engineer Stores £2,543,000, *Rep.* July 13*, 1239.
- Rewards and Pensions and other non-effective Charges for Officers—£1,694,000, *Rep.* July 13*, 1239.
- Supplies and Clothing—£4,492,000, *Rep.* July 13*, 1238.
- War Office and Army Accounts Department—£559,000, *Com., July 12*, 1074.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O. [Croydon]
- Army
  - Artillery
    - Batteries, Cost of Upkeep of, *July 9*, 503.
    - Militia Garrison Artillery, Utilising Services of for Ammunition Columns, proposed, *July 12*, 1122, 1123.
    - Number of Guns required for a Battery, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1125.
    - Reserve for, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1121.
    - Strength of—Number of Battalions capable of taking the Field in Fighting Strength, *July 12*, 1121, 1122.
  - Expansion, Necessity for, *July 12*, 1120, 1123.
  - Guards
    - Average Cost per Man, *July 9*, 502; *July 12*, 1121.
    - Cost per Battalion per Annum, *July 9*, 503.
    - Reduction in Strength of, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1120.
    - Reservists, Statistics as to, *July 9*, 502.
  - *Personnel*
    - Reduction in, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1120.
    - Wastage, Provision for, *July 12*, 1124.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O—*cont.*
- Army—*cont.*
  - Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1119–1127.
    - Opportunity for adequate Discussion of, Prior to carrying into Effect, *July 12*, 1119; *July 13*, 1200.
- Cape Colony—Maraisburg School Board, alleged Dismissal of English Teachers by, *July 16*, 1328, 1329.
- Militia, Enlistment into the Regular Army through, Proposals for dealing with, *July 12*, 1126.

Artillery
- *See under* Army.

Ascot
- Metropolitan Police, Charge for Employment of, etc.
  - *Qs.* Dr. Cooper; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 10*, 720.

Ascot District Gas (Electric Lighting) Bill
- *l. Rep.* July 10*, 653.
- 3R.* *July 13*, 1173.

Ashbourne, Lord
- Magistrates, Ireland
  - Disloyal Speeches by, Inciting to Illegal and Criminal Acts — Attitude of H.M. Government, *July 12*, 1022.
  - Procedure as to Appointment of, *July 13*, 1021, 1022, 1026.

Ashley, Mr. W. W. [Lancashire, N., Blackpool]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 4*, 66, 69, 95, 96; *July 9*, 579; *July 10*, 744, 749, 763, 780, 785, 787, 825, 826; *July 16*, 1363, 1364, 1399–1401.
  - Part III., Proposals as to, *July 9*, 525.
- Egypt—Proposals as to British Garrison, *July 9*, 510.
- Morocco — Proposals for Abolition of Slavery, *July 10*, 718, 719.
- Yeomanry Training—Delay in Payment, *July 11*, 867.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Fife, E.]
- Army Reorganisation Proposals — Opportunity for Adequate Discussion of, Prior to carrying into Effect, *July 13*, 1199, 1200.
- Custom House Quay—Decision as to utilising as Extension to Billingsgate Market, *July 16*, 1304, 1334.
- Dog Tax— Officials responsible for Assessment, etc., *July 4*, 30; *July 11*, 875.

[*cont.*

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
- Estate Duties
  - Assessment and Collection, Procedure in, *July 12*, 1058.
  - Committee, Witnesses examined by, *July 11*, 863.
- Income Tax
  - American Beef Companies, Assessment of, *July 9*, 497.
  - Arrears, Regulations as to clearing up, *July 12*, 1031.
  - Assessment and Collection System, *July 12*, 1033.
  - Estimate of Percentage of Assessments Corrected during last Five Years, proposed, *July 12*, 1032.
- Revenue Bill, Proposals as to and Effect of, *July 6*, 356.
- Taxation
  - Collection and Assessment, Revision of Present System, Recommendations of Horsfall Committee, etc., *July 4*, 31.
  - Local — Legislative Proposals for dealing with Question, *July 16*, 1304.

Assam
- Bengal, Eastern, *see under* India.
- Udoya Patni, Circumstances of Execution of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Morley *July 4*, 12.
  - *Qs.* Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Ellis, *July 10*, 718.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bright; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 12*, 1046.

Astbury, Mr. J. M. [Lancashire, Southport]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 78–80.

Athea
- Rural Postman, Wages of.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 6*, 355, 356.

Athy
- Post Office Site, Decision as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 5*, 248, 249.

Attorney-General
- *Sir J. Lawson Walton.*

Attorney-General for Ireland
- *Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.*

Australasia
- [*For* particular Colonies, etc., *see their names.*]
- Mail Service, *see* Post Office.
- Tinned Meat Trade—Regulations as to Inspection, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 9*, 488.

Autumn Session
- *See under* Parliamentary Procedure—Session.

Avebury, Lord
- London County Council
  - Expenditure of, Enormous Increase in, *July 9*, 447, 449.
  - Financial Methods of—*Status* of Credit, etc., *July 9*, 447–449.
  - Housing Schemes, Buildings, etc.—Excess of Expenditure over Estimate, *July 9*, 448, 449.
  - Tramway Services, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates and Receipts, *July 9*, 447.
  - Undertakings of, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates, *July 9*, 447–449.
- London County Council (Money) Bill 2R., *July 9*, 447–450.

Bacup Corporation Bill
- *Rep.* July 13*, 1173.

Bahrain Islands
- Trade Report Presented, *July 10*, 655.

Baker Street and Waterloo Railway Bill
- *l. Rep.* July 10*, 653.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire N., Chorley]
- Coal Mines in Lancashire, Inspection of, *July 4*, 32.
- Custom House Quay—Decision as to Utilising as Extension to Billingsgate Market, *July 16*, 1303.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 91, 126; *July 9*, 554, 567, 571–573, 596, 609, 610, 611; *July 10*, 741, 742, 743, 747, 767, 770, 801, 802; *July 11*, 938, 939, 941, 954–956; *July 16*, 1368, 1374.
  - Certified Efficient School Managers, Powers of to make Agreements as to Religious Instruction, *July 6*, 357.
  - School Hours, Definition of, *July 11*, 881.
  - State-aided School Grants, Administration, etc., of, *July 9*, 525.
  - Voluntary School Appeals against transfer, Provisions as to, *July 16*, 1345.
- Education Board Staff, Proposals for Increasing, *July 11*, 863.
- Wireless Telegraphy Bill, Lords Amendments, *Con.*, *July 13*, 1202–1204, 1207.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. [London]

Army

Artillery

Militia Garrison Artillery, Utilising Services of for Ammunition Columns, proposed, *July 12*, 1160.

Peace, and War, Establishment—New Scheme for, *July 12*, 1160–1161.

Strength of—Number of Battalions capable of taking the Field in Fighting Strength, *July 12*, 1160.

Terms of Service, Alteration in, *July 12*, 1161.

Expeditionary Force, Strength and Composition of, *July 12*, 1161–1163.

Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1157–1164.

Opportunity for Adequate Discussion of, Prior to Carrying into Effect, *July 12*, 1157. *July 13*, 1192–1194, 1197, 1198, 1199.

Autumn Session—Business to be taken during, *July 13*, 1191.

Bills—Measures proposed to be dealt with during Remainder of Session, *July 13*, 1190, 1191, 1194, 1196.

Business of the House, Course of, *July 10*, 739; *July 11*, 897–899.

Defence of the Empire—Committee of Defence, Valuable Work of, *July 12*, 1158.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 66, 69, 71, 74–77, 107–109, 136–140; *July 9*, 549, 550, 573, 574, 581, 582, 631, 632; *July 10*, 742, 745, 751, 755, 758, 769, 773, 774, 776, 777, 789, 790, 798, 799; *July 11*, 904, 914–917, 935; *July 16*, 1369, 1373, 1392–1395.

Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill—Committed to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 4*, 62.

Great Yarmouth Parliamentary Election Petition.

Proceedings at Trial, Allegations against Mr. Justice Grantham, *July 6*, 402–408.

Political Bias and Partisanship, Charges of, *July 6*, 404–406.

Labourers, Ireland, Advances—Resolution, *July 11*, 991, 992.

Musical Copyright Bill, proposals as to, *July 5*, 249.

Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1450, 1451.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.—*cont.*

Questions—Provocative Wording of Reply by Under-Secretary for the Colonies, *July 5*, 220.

Supply—Time allotted for, Inadequacy of, alleged, *July 13*, 1191, 1192.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill

Eleven o'Clock Rule, Motion for Suspension of—Procedure as to, *July 5*, 250, 251, 252.

Government Policy as to, Information regarding, *July 6*, 415–417.

Trade Disputes Bill—Government Attitude towards—Time for Discussion, etc., *July 13*, 1191, 1195, 1196.

Volunteers—Functions of—New Scheme for a Territorial Army, *July 12*, 1159. 1160.

Ballinakill

Oyster Beds—Licence Applications of Miss Duane and Mrs. Browne.

Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1318.

Ballinamore

McLoughlin, P., Eviction of, from Shop—Police Assistance, etc.

Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1350.

Rate Collector—Appointment of Mr. P. Curran.

Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 50, 51.

Ballymoney

Post Office Messenger to Balnamore, alleged Detention of, at Head Office.

Q. Mr. Glendinning; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 11*, 860, 861.

Ballynanty

Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Hartigan.

Q. Mr. Lundon, Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 244, 245.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [City of London]

Army Reorganisation—Opportunity for adequate discussion, Prior to carrying into effect, *July 13*, 1201.

Civil Service Estimates—Papers Relating to, Absence of — Motion to Report Progress, *July* 13, 1209.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 126; *July 9*, 611, 612, 615; *July 10*, 818; *July 11*, 972.

Religious Instruction—Operation of Article 15 of Code, *July 5*, 206.

Poplar

Poor Law Inquiry—Publication of Notes, etc., proposed, *July 4*, 34.

Poor Law Schools and Receiving House for Children, Cost of, *July 4* 35.

[*cont*

Banbury, Sir F. G.—*cont.*

Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1448.

Railway Rates for Agricultural Produce—Report and Recommendations of Departmental Committee, *July 13*, 1214, 1219–1222.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Government Policy as to, *July 6*, 420.

Transvaal Northern Railway Bonds, Value of, *July 4*, 26.

Wei-hai-Wei, Allocation of Vote for, *July 12*, 1045.

Bankruptcy

Annual Report Presented, *July 16*, 1275, 1300.

Bann River

Drainage, proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 6*, 358.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1351.

Baring, Mr. G. [Isle of Wight]

Army
Guards, Reduction in Strength of, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1138, 1139.
Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1137–1139.

Barker, Mr. J. [Penryn and Falmouth]

Grove Park Workhouse Officials' Salaries, Decision as to, *July 11*, 878.

Barna

Pier, Inspection of, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 892.

Barna Estate

Purchase of, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, etc.
Qs. Mr. C. Devlin; *As.* Mr. Bryce *July 10*, 736.

Barnard, Mr. E. B. [Kidderminster]

Agriculture Board, Grants to, from the Treasury—Comparison with Grants to Irish Board, *July 13*, 1233, 1234.

Barnes, Mr. J. N. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]

Luton School, Chatham, Alleged Flogging of Children in—Prosecution of E. W. Lemmon, etc., *July 16*, 1344.

Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory, Sale of—Date of commencing Negotiations, *July 16*, 1321.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]

Poor Law Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *July 10*, 735.

Bathurst, Earl

Tidworth Barracks—Hospital, Church, and Recreation - Room Accommodation, Proposals as to, *July 6*, 336, 337.

Beach, Mr. M. Hicks [Gloucester, Tewkesbury]

Abyssinian Railway Agreement, Provisions of, *July 9*, 513.

Aland Islands, Alleged Russian Occupation of, *July 9*, 512.

Butter Adulteration, Measures proposed for safeguarding against, *July 13*, 1233.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1408, 1409.

Militia Winter Training Scheme, Battalions selected for, *July 9*, 504.

Railway Rates for Agricultural Produce—Report and Recommendations of Departmental Committee, *July 13*, 1232, 1233.

Russia, Visit of British Fleet to, *July 9*, 512.

Taxation, Local, Reform of, Government Intentions as to dealing with, *July 13*, 1233.

Beauchamp, Earl

London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 3R. *July 16*, 1256–1258.

Beauchamp, Mr. H. W. [Suffolk, Lowestoft]

Naval Manœuvres, Merchant Vessels taking part in, *July 11*, 865.

Wireless Telegraphy Licences issued to Lloyd's, *July 4*, 33.

Beaumont, Mr. H. [Sussex, Eastbourne]

Postage Rates on 15 Gram Letters, *July 12*, 1039.

Beck, Mr. A. C. [Cambridge, Wisbech]

Fruit Industry—Reports on Condition of Crops in Holland, France, and Germany, during Season, proposed, *July 13*, 1222, 1223.

Erysipelas Epidemic among Swine in Wisbech—Compensation to Owners for Animals destroyed, *July 13*, 1223.

Belfast

Patterson, Rev. R. D., Tenor of Speech delivered by.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Russell, Lord Turnour; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 9*, 530, 531.

Post Office—Inadequate Arrangements for Paying Money Orders of Royal Irish Rifles, alleged.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 4*, 57.

Troops in, Meat supplied to.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9*, 487.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis]

Navy
"Africa" Trials, Alleged Narrow Escape from running on Rocks during, *July 9*, 481.

[*cont.*

Bellairs, Mr. C.—*cont.*
Navy—*cont.*
Dockyards—Maximum and Minimum Number employed in, since 1900, *July 9*, 495.
Manœuvres
Merchant Vessels taking part in. *July 9*, 482.
Result of, *July 12*, 1044.
Shipbuilding Statistics (1900–1906), *July 12*, 1031.
Turco-Egyptian Difficulty—British Naval Vessels in the Levant, *July 12*, 1045.

Belloc, Mr. H. V. P. R. [Salford, S.]
Africa, South — Cotton Goods shipped before increased Duty was made known, Duty Payable on, *July 16*, 1331.
Egypt—British Officers, Attack on—Sentences inflicted, etc., *July 12*, 1055.
Malta Protestant Mission Services, Decision as to, *July 5*, 219.

Bennett, Mr. E. N. [Oxfordshire, Woodstock]
Congo Free State
Belgian Administration of—Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives, etc., *July 5*, 306–309.
Consular Courts, Right of Great Britain to Establish, *July 5*, 309.
Stannard, Rev. E., Sentence passed on—Tabling Vice-Consul Armstrong's Report, etc., *July 16*, 1305.

Beresford Estate
Sale Negotiations for, etc.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1069.

Bermondsey
Unemployment in, owing to Cattle Exclusion Regulations.
Os. Dr. Cooper, *July 13*, 1224.

Bertram, Mr. J. [Herts, Hitchin]
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1458.

Bettyville Manister
Re-instatement Claim of Mr. E. Hartigan, *Q.* Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 731.

Bills
House of Lords, Introduction into
Measures promised in the King's Speech, Information as to.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 5*, 172–179; Marquess of Ripon, 179–183; Earl of Camperdown, 189, 190; Lord Heneage, 190.

Bills—*cont.*
House of Lords—*cont.*
Origination of more Measures in the Lords, proposed.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 5*, 178; Marquess of Ripon, 179; Lord Burghclere, 185–187.
Period for, Inadequate Time for Discussion under present System, etc.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 5*, 174–180; Lord Newton, 183–185; Viscount Goschen, 188.
Revision, Powers of, Necessity for exercising.
Os. Viscount Goschen, *July 5*, 188.
Measures proposed to be dealt with during remainder of Session.
Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 13*, 1189, 1190; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1190, 1191, 1194–1196; Mr. L. Hardy, 1197.
No Motion to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11 to be accepted during remainder of Session.
Motion [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *July 13*, 1188, 1190, 1201.

Bills of Exchange Act (1882) Amendment Bill
c. *Rep.* July 4*, 60.

Birmingham
Vauxhall Station—Inquiry into death of Mr. Yardley, etc.
Q. Mr. Wardle; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 5*, 234.

Birmingham Small Arms Company
Secret Reserve Fund, Alleged Formation of.
Q. Mr. Branch; *A.* Mr. Buchanan. *July 11*, 865.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*President, Board of Education* [Bristol, N.]
Age Limit for commencing, Alteration in, proposed, *July 16*, 1344.
Agricultural Instruction, Facilities for, *July 9*, 523.
Chatham—Alleged Flogging of Children in Luton School, Prosecution of E. W. Lemmon, etc., *July 16*, 1344.
Cost in heavily rated Areas—Grants available (1906–7), and Work of Committee of Inquiry, *July 11*, 880.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 67, 70, 71, 73, 74, 82, 86, 103, 110–112, 118, 140–142, 143; *July 9*, 536, 537, 539, 541, 545, 548, 555, 557, 558–560, 563, 564, 565, 580, 581, 587, 588; 590, 593, 594, 603, 607, 609, 629, 631; *July 10*, 741, 742, 743, 745–747, 750, 752, 755, 757, 758, 759, 764, 767, 768, 773, 775, 776, 777, 778, 781, 785–787, 790, 814, 825, 830; *July 11*, 920–924, 936, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 967; *July 16*, 1364–1366, 1369, 1370, 1372, 1373, 1374, 1375, 1395–1398, 1414–1417, 1430, 1434.
    - Certified Efficient School Managers, Powers of, to make Agreements as to Religious Instruction, *July 6*, 357.
    - Clause 4—Defraying Cost of Public Inquiry, *July 10*, 709.
    - Clause 10, Sub-section (2), Amendment of, proposed, *July 16*, 1345.
    - Extended Facilities, Procedure in demanding, etc., *July 9*, 526.
    - Grant, Proposals as to Distribution of, *July 9*, 493.
    - Part III., Proposals as to, *July 9*, 526.
    - Religious Instruction—Article 15 of Code, Operation of, *July 5*, 206.
    - School Hours, Definition of, *July 11*, 881.
    - Schools connected with Institutions, Provisions as to. *July 4*, 19; *July 5*, 205.
    - Schools with Extended Facilities—Constitution of Managers, *July 10*, 708.
    - State-aided Schools
        - Control of, *July 11*, 881.
        - Grants, Administration, etc., of, *July 9*, 525.
    - Teachers
        - Agreements, Enforcement of, *July 9*, 527.
        - Compensation for Discharge, *July 13*, 1188.
        - Superannuation Claims under Amended Form of Clause 4, *July 9*, 524.
        - Tenure of Office, Conditions of *July 9*, 525.
    - Voluntary Schools Transferred
        - Appeals against Transfer, Provisions as to, *July 16*, 1346.
        - Position of, *July 6*, 356.
- Education Board Staff, Proposals for Increasing, *July 11*, 863.
- Library of Board, Preparation of Printed Catalogue, proposed, *July 10*, 706.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

- Llanelian School Teacher, Salary of, *July 9*, 524.
- Medical Inspection of Children, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 524.
- Medical Officers Appointed, *July 11*, 880.
- Schools Promoted by other than Local Education Authorities, Number of, *July 9*, 494.
- State-aided Schools, Number of Children Attending, *July 10*, 708.
- Teachers
    - Salaries, Arrangements for Paying by Local Authorities, *July 5*, 200.
    - Superannuation Fund, Amount to Credit of, etc., *July 10*, 709.
- Vaccination
    - Pupil Teachers—Regulations as to Conscientious Objection, *July 16*, 1345.
    - Training Colleges, Regulations in, *July 11*, 881.

Blake, Mr. E. [Longford, S.]

- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 72, 120, 124; *July 9*, 603; *July 10*, 778.
- Great Yarmouth Parliamentary Election Petition' Proceedings—Political Bias and Partisanship, Charges of, *July 6*, 413.

Blennerhasset Estate

- Reinstatement Claim of T. Dooner.
    - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 6*, 358.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry, S.]

- Blennerhasset Estate — Reinstatement Claim of T. Dooner, *July 6*, 358.
- Butler Estate—Disposal of Baslickane, Farm, *July 5*, 208.
- Civil Service Examinations for Boy Clerks, Information as to, *July 4*, 20.
- Herrings, Irish, Special Brand for, proposed, *July 10*, 732.
- Trade Statistics for Ireland, Facilities for Compiling, etc., *July 4*, 57.

Bombay, Baroda, and Central India Railway Bill

- Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 5*, 158.

Borneo

- Brunei and Sarawak, Relations between—Office dealing with Question, etc.
    - *Q.* Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Sir E. Grey *July 9*, 490, 491.
- Sultan of Brunei, Death of,—Proposals as to Incorporating Brunei with Sarawak.
    - *Os.* Sir E. Sassoon, *July 5*, 301.

Borrisokane Union
Haire, Mr., Valuations of Land by—Qualifications and Conditions of Appointment.
Qs. Mr. Hogan, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1352.

Bottomley, Mr. H. W. [Hackney, S.]
Servia—Conditions of Resuming Diplomatic Relations by Great Britain, *July 10*, 719.
Southwark County Court—Judge's Decision in Case under Workmen's Compensation Act, *July 9*, 513.

Bournemouth
Winton Post Office, *status of.*
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 9*, 483.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, Norwood]
Gateshead—Case of H. Maughan, *July 16*, 1338, 1339.

Brace, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, S.]
Army
Expenditure—Reduction of, Necessity for, and Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1156.
Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1156.
Vaccination Exemption Certificates—Case of Mr. W. Griffiths, *July 9*, 516.

Bramley Union
Endsor, C., Case of—Inquiry proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 16*, 1342.

Branch, Mr. J. [Middlesex, Enfield]
Army
Ordnance Factories — Vaccination Regulations, *July 12*, 1036.
Sparkbrook Factory, Proposals for Allocating Orders to, *July 11*, 866.
Birmingham Small Arms Company, Secret Reserve Fund formed by, alleged, *July 11*, 865.

Brassey, Lord
Merchant Shipping.
British Seamen, Training of, Necessity for Establishing State-aided Training Ships, etc., *July 5*, 164–167.
Foreign and Lascar Seamen, Increase in Number of, *July 5*, 163, 164.

Brazil
Pernambuco—Trade Report Presented, *July 16*, 1275.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 120; *July 9*, 550, 607, 610, 614; *July 10*, 800, 801; *July 16*, 1390.

Bright, Mr. J. A. [Oldham]
Assam—Circumstances of Execution of Udoy Patny, *July 12*, 1046.

Bristol
Prison Visiting Committee—Rules Presented, *July 11*, 855; *July 12*, 996.

Brodie, Mr. H. C. [Surrey, Reigate]
Vagrancy Commission Recommendations, Adoption of, *July 4*, 9.

Brunner, Sir J. T. [Cheshire, Northwich]
Business of the House — Government Business to have Precedence until end of Session, and Adjournment of the House to be made without Question put, *July 13*, 1200.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1401–1403, 1411.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Aberdeen, S.]
Abbeyleix — Inquiry into Allegations against Head Constable Spence, *July 4*, 53; *July 6*, 359.
Adair Estate—Reinstatement Claim of T. Flanagan, *July 9*, 483.
Administrative Boards in Ireland, Return as to, proposed, *July 10*, 706.
Aghanlish—Decision in Case of P. McGlone. *July 16*, 1306.
Agricultural Organisation Association.
Founder of, etc., *July 9*, 498.
Payments to, *July 9*, 498; *July 10*, 735.
Statements as to Expenditure, *July 16*, 1354.
Agriculture and Technical Department.
Experimental Farms, Profit and Loss on, *July 16*, 1354.
Grants to and Work of, *July 4*, 42.
Winter Dairying, Proposals as to *July 4*, 47.
Allotments Act—Extension to Ireland proposed, *July 16*, 1316.
Ballinakill Oyster Beds—Licence Applications of Miss Duane and Mrs. Browne, *July 16*, 1318.
Ballinamore.
Police Asistance at Eviction of Mr. P. McLoughlin, *July 16*, 1350.
Rate Collector—Appointment of Mr. P. Curran, *July 4*, 51.
Ballynanty—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Hartigan, *July 5*, 244, 245.
Bann River Drainage, Proposals as to, *July 6*, 358; *July 16*, 1351.
Barna Estate, Purchase of, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, etc., *July 10*, 736.
Barna Pier, Inspection of, proposed, *July 11*, 892.
Beresford Estate, Sale Negotiations for *July 12*, 1069.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Bettyville Manister—Reinstatement Claim of Mr. E. Hartigan, *July 10*, 731.
- Blennerhassett Estate — Reinstatement Claim of T. Dooner, *July 6*, 358.
- Borrisokane Union—Qualifications, etc. of Mr. Haire, *July 16*, 1352, 1353.
- Butler Estate—Disposal of Baslickane Farm, *July 5*, 208.
- Caldbeck Estate, Purchase Negotiations for, *July 16*, 1320.
- Cavan Evicted Tenants—Reinstatements effected, etc., *July 16*, 1353.
- Clanricarde Estate—Reinstatement Claim of P. Fahy, *July 9*, 484.
- Clare Police Force, Reduction of, proposed, *July 10*, 734.
- Clifden Bridewell, Cost of, Number of Persons detained in, etc., *July 16*, 1319.
- Closetoken—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Duffy, *July 9*, 533.
- Congested Districts Board
  - Land Purchase, Price paid, etc., *July 4*, 46.
  - Records of Land purchased, etc., Confidential Nature of, *July 4*, 43–45.
- Congested Districts Inquiry, Scope of, *July 10*, 734; *July 12*, 1067.
- Constabulary
  - Cryan, Constable, Charges against in Carroll Case, etc., *July 12*, 1068.
  - Wade, District-Inspector, Allowance to, for Man-servant, *July 16*, 1349.
- Coolkill—Reinstatement Claims of F. Reilly and Mrs. Coyle, *July 12*, 1042; *July 16*, 1355.
- Cork—Agriculture Department Schemes put into operation, *July 4*, 47.
- Cornamona—Decision in Case of Mr. O'Malley, *July 11*, 888.
- Craughwell—Stone thrown at Window of Mrs. Ryan, *July 11*, 888.
- Darcy Estate Grazing Farm, Disposal of, *July 16*, 1303.
- Deane Drake Estate—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Kavanagh, *July 5*, 242, 243.
- Deaths—Annual Lists for Parliamentary Registration Purposes, Remuneration for Furnishing, *July 5*, 207.
- Delmege Estate, Purchase of and Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, *July 11*, 893, 894.
- Donaghmore Glebe National School, Reason for Withdrawal of Grants from, *July 4*, 56.
- Douglas Estate—Reinstatement of Mrs. K. Scanlan, *July 11*, 895.
- Drumcoo—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. E. McGuire, *July 12*, 1042.
- Dromod Police Hut, Abolition of, proposed, *July 12*, 1070.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Dromahane—Reinstatement of Mrs. O'Regan, *July 4*, 41.
- Drumraney—Alleged Attack on House of Mr. J. Cassells, *July 12*, 1068.
- Dublin Corporation
  - Irish Language, Use of, on Rolling Stock, *July 12*, 1035.
  - Refusal of Access of Local Government Auditor to Books alleged, *July 11*, 894.
- Dundrum Inner Bay Crossing, Erection of Bridge at, proposed, *July 10*, 729.
- Dungarvan—Decision as to Cunnigar Causeway, *July 16*, 1320.
- Dunmore, Purchase Negotiations for, *July 11*, 890.
- Education
  - Consultative Committee, Constitution and Work of, *July 4*, 50.
  - Intermediate Board, Rules, etc.
    - Minutes and Correspondence, Decision as to Tabling, *July 5*, 203.
    - Proposals as to, *July 5*, 209.
  - National School Teachers
    - Salaries, Proposals as to, *July 4*, 14.
  - School Building Grants, Decision as to, *July 4*, 50; *July 6*, 359.
  - State-aided Schools, Number of Children attending, *July 10*, 712.
- Ellis Estate Cattle Mutilation Case—Measures taken to Discover Miscreants, etc., *July 10*, 737.
- Emigration, Irish, during 1906, *July 16*, 1351.
- Faulkner Estate Purchase Negotiations, *July 12*, 1040.
- Fisheries—Drift Nets, Decision as to Restrictions on use of, *July 5*, 209.
- Fuge Estate—Reinstatement Applications Received, *July 4*, 41.
- Glenties Union Clerk, Increase of Salary of, *July 16*, 1348.
- Great Southern and Western Railway Rates on Agricultural Exhibits, *July 9*, 497.
- Herrings
  - Downings Bay—Use of Title by Scotch Curers, alleged, *July 10*, 732.
  - Special Brand for, proposed, *July 10*, 732.
- Holdenstown—Reinstatement Claims of Mrs. Sexton's Representatives, *July 9*, 484.
- Home Rule, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 733.
- Inny, Upper, Drainage Board, Constitution and Work of, *July 12*, 1043.
- Kilfinane School, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 244.

[*cont.*

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Kilkeary Land Commission Holdings—Rent Agreement of Tenants, *July 4*, 46.
- Kilkenny, Reinstatement Claims in, *July 9*, 485.
- Kilmaine, Lord, Estate of—Date of Hearing Land Purchase Case, *July 12*, 1041.
- King-Harman Estate—Terms of Purchase of Ballinamuck portion, *July 5*, 248.
- King's County Assizes—Crier's Fee in Case of Young *v.* Brennan, *July 10*, 733.
- Kingston Estate — Corracunna Farm Dispute, Abolition of Police Post, etc., *July 11*, 893.
- Kinvara Harbour Works, Decision as to, *July 9*, 532, 533.
- Labourers, Ireland—Advances—Resolution, *July 9*, 651; *July 11*, 990, 991, 992.
- Labourers (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill
  - Extension to Untenanted Land, proposed, *July 4*, 40.
  - Loans to Farmers for Improvements to Dwellings, etc., proposed, *July 14*, 51, 52.
  - Urban Districts, Extension to, proposed, *July 9*, 500.
- Lamberts Minors Estate, Proposals for Sale of, *July 16*, 1308.
- Land Commission
  - Additional Judicial Commissioner, Appointment of, proposed, *July 5*, 245, 246.
  - Postcards, Official, Alleged use of, by Ex-sub-Commissioner, *July 11*, 893.
  - Procedure in fixing Rents, *July 11*, 886.
  - Temporary Assistant Commissioners, Land Valuations by on Expiration of Term of Office, *July 11*, 891.
- Land Purchase
  - Compulsory Declaration as Purchaser, Number of Cases of, *July 11*, 883.
  - Correspondence with Estates Commissioners, Access to, by Landlords and Tenants, *July 16*, 1349.
  - Estates Commissioners—Instructions, Authorship of, *July 12*, 1067, 1068.
  - Mining, Mineral and Sporting Rights, Decision as to Power to Dispose of, *July 16*, 1307.
  - Price, Equity of—Reason for not Referring Cases of Disagreement to Judicial Decision, *July 11*, 884.
  - Tenants' Improvements, Protection of, *July 11*, 885.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
- Land Purchase—*cont.*
  - Untenanted Land Return
    - Evicted Farms, Inclusion of, *July 11*, 883.
    - Scope of, *July 4*, 39, 40.
  - Zones, Price within—Effect of King-Harman *v.* Hayes Case, etc., *July 4*, 47.
- Leader Estate—Reinstatement Claim of D. FitzPatrick and Mrs. Cronin, *July 4*, 45.
- Leefin Grazing Farm, Disposal of, *July 16*, 1302.
- Lewis Estate—Sale Negotiations, *July 10*, 730.
- Limerick
  - Evicted Tenants, Inquiry into Cases of, *July 4*, 55.
  - Fair Rent Appeals, Decision of Court as to, *July 4*, 56.
- Lisburn Workhouse Officials—Decision as to Inquiry, *July 11*, 858.
- Local Government Board
  - Accounts of Local Authorities, Date of and Fees for, Auditing, *July 16*, 1317.
  - Inspectors, Return as to, proposed, *July 11*, 884.
- Loughrea Town Hall, Ownership and Use of, *July 12*, 1034.
- Lunacy Grants, Effect of Proposed Change in System of Paying, *July 4*, 54.
- Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 16*, 1355.
- Macroom Allotments Scheme, Decision as to, *July 11*, 858.
- Maghery Bay—Reply to Memorial as to Boat Slip, *July 9*, 499.
- Magistrates—Fees on Appointment, *July 10*, 732.
- Martyn Estate—Disposal of Cooks Town Farm, *July 10*, 730.
- Mayo Marine Works Schemes, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 486.
- Mullycastle—Reinstatement Claim of Mr. M'Evoy, *July 12*, 1043.
- North Camas—Reinstatement Claims of C. Walsh and J. Toomey, *July 4*, 49.
- Perry-Knox-Gore Estate—Purchase proposals for Crannagh Farm, *July 5*, 248; *July 9*, 487.
- Poor Law Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *July 10*, 735.
- Railway Inquiry, Proposals as to and Scope of, *July 5*, 208; *July 16*, 1356.
- Return No. 173 of 1903, Information Contained, *July 4*, 48.
- Rockfield Farm, Sale Proposals for, *July 16*, 1317.

Bryce, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Roo Estate
Enlargement of Holdings, proposed, *July 16*, 1307.
Untenanted Lands, Disposal of, *July 12*, 1071.
Royal Canal, Condition of, *July 4*, 49.
Sandes Estate, Purchase Proposals for, *July 12*, 1041.
Sheehy, Major, Estate of—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Scanlan, *July 4*, 55.
Smith, Captain, Estate of—Case of A. Beggan, *July 12*, 1070.
Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, Purchase Negotiations for, *July 5*, 247.
Trinity College Commission—Qualifications of Dr. D. Hyde, *July 11*, 889, 890.
Tullycross Police Barracks, Discontinuance of, proposed, *July 16*, 1319.
Tyndall Estate—Rent Recovery Proceedings, *July 4*, 43.
Waring Estate—Reinstatement Claim of S. Caldbeck, *July 9*, 485.
Warrenscourt Estate, Sale Proposals for, *July 11*, 857.
Westmeath Untenanted Land, Inquiry into, Proposed, *July 12*, 1035.
Wicklow Magistracy, Religion of, *July 5*, 243.
Woodford
M'Mahon, J., Prosecution of, for not taking out Dog Licence, *July 4*, 53.
United Irish League Meeting, Speeches made at, *July 4*, 52.

Buchanan, Mr. T. R.—*Financial Secretary, War Office* [Perthshire, E.]
Barracks
Piershill Barracks, Sanitary Condition of, *July 11*, 866.
Preston, Proposals as to Repairing, *July 11*, 866.
Birmingham Small Arms Company, Secret Reserve Fund Formed by, alleged, *July 11*, 865.
Coldstream Guards — Arrangements for Despatch of Battalion to Egypt, *July 16*, 1323.
Militia, Garrison Artillery, Proposals as to, *July 16*, 1322.
Sparbrook Small Arms Factory.
Date of Commencing Negotiations for Sale of, *July 16*, 1322.
Proposals for Allocating Orders to, *July 11*, 866.
Two Battalion Regiments, Reserves of, Cost per Man, etc., *July 11*, 868.
University Candidates, Revision of Regulations as to, proposed, *July 11*, 867.
Yeomanry Training—Delay in Payment, *July 11*, 867.

Buckhaven, Methil and Innerleven Burgh Extension Bill
l. Rep. July 16*, 1242.

Buckmaster, Mr. S. O. [Cambridge]
Great Yarmouth Parliamentary Election Petition — Proceedings at Trial Allegations against Mr. Justice Grantham, *July 6*, 378–387.
Political Bias and Partisanship, Charges of, *July 6*, 384–387.

Burdett-Coutts, Mr. W. L. A. B. [Westminster]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 95; *July 10*, 753; *July 11*, 952, 953.

Burghclere, Lord
Bills—Origination of more Measures in the Lords, proposed, *July 5*, 185–187.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Date of Introduction in the House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 185.
Ground Game Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 997, 998, 1001.
Land Tenure Bill, Policy of the Government as to, *July 5*, 187.

Burials Act, 1855
Amendment of, Proposed—Decision in Godden Case, etc.
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 16*, 1343.

Burmah
Second Border Regiment Corporal, Court Martial Sentence on.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 16*, 1324, 1325.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
Agricultural Rates Act, Basis of Payments under, *July 9*, 496.
Belmont Asylum Enteric Fever Outbreak, Delay in Notifying, *July 9*, 521.
Bramley Union—Enquiry into Case of C. Endsor, proposed, *July 16*, 1342.
Burials Act, 1855, Amendment of—Decision in Godden Case, etc., *July 16*, 1343.
Chesshire, Miss A. L., Case of, *July 12*, 1061,
Chester-le-Street, Case of R. Dixon, *July 10*, 725.
Coal Assessment for Rating Purposes—Inquiry into Present System, proposed, *July 9*, 496.
Food, Imported—Amendment of Law as to Inspection, proposed, *July 9*, 492.
Grove Park Workhouse Officials' Salaries, Decision as to, *July 11*, 878.

[*cont.*

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
  Handcross Hill Motor Omnibus Accident—Proposals as to Inquiry, etc., *July 12*, 1172.
  Infectious Diseases—Inquiries by Friends of Patients in Hospitals, Regulations as to, *July 9*, 520.
  Motor
    Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *July 9*, 522.
    Dust Nuisance, Proposals for Dealing with, *July 4*, 21.
    Omnibus Testing, Regulations as to, *July 16*, 1315.
    Speed Regulation—Applications Received from Local Authorities, *July 12*, 1062.
    Traction Engines.
      Revision of Rules as to Highways, proposed, *July 4*, 10.
      Traffic in European Capitals, *July 11*, 878.
  Pontardawe Medical Officer—Appointment of Dr. G. Griffiths, *July 16*, 1341.
  Poor Law—Filial Liability, Amendment of Law as to, proposed, *July 5*, 236.
  Staines Workhouse — Discontinuance of Practice of Allowing Children to watch Ascot Visitors, proposed, *July 20*, 877, 878.
  Vaccination
    Bray, Vann and Bruin, Sentences on, *July 16*, 1341.
    Exemption Certificates—Number Granted, *July 11*, 877.
    Fees
      Proposals for Reduction of, *July 12*, 1062.
      Revision of Law, proposed, *July 9*, 522.
    National Vaccine Establishment — Source of Supply of Lymph, *July 4*, 21.
    Statistics—Examination of Registers, etc., proposed, *July 16*, 1342, 1343.
  Vagrancy Commission Recommendations, Adoption of, *July 4*, 9.

Bury Corporation Bill
  l. Commons Amendts. *Con.* July 6*, 334.

Business of the House
  Bills, *see that title.*
  Course of
    Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir J. Jardine, *July 10*, 739; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Hay, *July 11*, 897–899.

Business of the House—*cont.*
  Government Business to have Precedence until end of Session—Adjournment of the House at Conclusion of Government Business without Question put, etc.
    Motion (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman), *July 13*, 1188, 1190, 1201.
      Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 13*, 1188–1190; *Mr. K.* Hardie, 1199; Sir J. Brunner, 1200; Mr. Speaker, 1200.
  King's Speech, Measures Promised in Information as to—Date of bringing to the House of Lords, etc.
    Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 5*, 172–179; Marquess of Ripon, 179–183; Lord Newton, 183; Lord Camperdown, 189, 190; Earl of Crewe, 196.

Butcher, Mr. S. H. [Cambridge University]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com. July 4*, 591, 592; *July 16*, 1367.

Bute (English and Welsh) Estates Bill
  l. Rep. July 10*, 653.
    3R.* *July 13*, 1173.
  c. 1R.* *July 13*, 1183.

Butler Estate
  Baslickane Farm, Disposal of.
    Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 208.

Butter
  Adulteration, Measures proposed for Safeguarding against.
    Os. Mr. H. Beach, *July 13*, 1233.

Butter Trade
  Report from Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence, presented, *July 9*, 535.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S.C.—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
  Athea Rural Postman, Wages of, *July 6*, 356.
  Athy Post Office Site, Decision as to, *July 5*, 249.
  Ballymoney Post Office Messenger, Duties of, *July 11*, 861.
  Belfast—Money Orders of Royal Irish Rifles, alleged Inadequate Arrangements for Paying, *July 4*, 57.
  Bournemouth—*Status* of Winton Post Office, *July 9*, 483.
  Carlisle—Duties of Telegraph Boys, *July 6*, 355.
  Carriekerry Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 11*, 895.

[*cont.*

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*
- Civil Service Estimates, Absence of Papers Relating to—Motion to Report Progress, *July 13*, 1209.
- Cleggan—Erection of Letter Box, proposed, *July 9*, 483.
- Contracts, Inspection of, *July 12*, 1071.
- Dring Telegraph Extension, Progress made with, *July 4*, 57.
- Dublin—Kingbridge Telegraph Office Staff Accommodation for Taking Meals, *July 10*, 738.
- Finchley and Hendon Telephone Service Exchange for, proposed, *July 11*, 857.
- Findhorn Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 11*, 879.
- Glasgow Postmen, Revision of Allowances to, *July 5*, 237.
- Limerick Learner, Reason for Resignation of, *July 10*, 737, 738.
- Longford Post Office Hours of Business, Decision as to, *July 4*, 57.
- Mail Service
  - American—Payment to German Vessels for Carriage of British Mails, *July 4*, 33.
  - Australian, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1033, 1063.
  - Canadian Mails, Sending by Allan Line, proposed, *July 11*, 879.
- Mill of Mey Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 4*, 9.
- Money Orders—Paying at House of Addressee, proposed, *July 5*, 201.
- Post Office Sites Bill, *Com. July 16*, 1447, 1448, 1449, 1451.
- Postage on Fifteen Gram Letters, *July 12*, 1039.
- Postmasters, Sub, Classification etc., of, *July 6*, 355.
- Savings Bank
  - Sixpence, Regulation as to Deposit of, *July 5*, 202.
  - Unclaimed Balances, Procedure in Transferring to Dormant Ledgers, Preparation of Index proposed, *July 16*, 1311.
- Sliddery Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 9*, 482.
- Switzerland—Vaccination of Postal Employees, *July 4*, 33.
- Tinahely Medical Officer—Appointment of Dr. J. Bolster, *July 16*, 1357.
- Tralee Telephone Extension, Proposals as to, *July 4*, 19.
- Volunteer Forces, Regulations as to Employees joining, *July 10*, 705.
- Wireless Telegraphy
  - Lloyds, Licences issued to, *July 4*, 34.
  - Return as to Working, Date of Circulating, *July 4*, 19.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*
- Wireless Telegraphy Bill, Lords Amendts., *Con. July 13*, 1206, 1208.

Byles, Mr. W. P. [Salford, N.]
- Ecclesiastical Discipline—Government Proposals for dealing with Question, *July 5*, 249.
- Musical Copyright Bill, *Com. July 16*, 1452, 1453, 1460.
- Natal Native Rising—Casualties among White and Black Forces, etc., *July 5*, 215.

Cairns, Mr. T. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
- Cattle Importation Restrictions
  - Removal of, proposed, *July 13*, 1235, 1236.
- Railways Rates on Agricultural Produce, *July 13*, 1235.

Caldbeck Estate
- Purchase Negotiations for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1320.

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M. [Dublin University]
- Donaghmore Glebe National School, Reason for Withdrawal of Grants from, *July 4*, 56.
- Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Information regarding, Government Policy as to, *July 6*, 418–490.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Stirling Burghs]
- Africa, South
  - Affairs of, Date of Tabling Papers on, *July 11*, 864.
  - Self-Government Proposals, Mode of carrying out, Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 11*, 865, 896; *July 12*, 1072; *July 16*, 1357, 1358.
- Aliens Act (Amendment) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 250.
- Army
  - Estimates, Proposal as to, *July 9*, 530.
  - Reorganisation Proposals, Opportunity for adequate Discussion of, prior to carrying into Effect, *July 13*, 1192, 1193. 1197, 1198.
- Bills
  - Measures proposed to be dealt with during Remainder of Session, *July 13*, 1189, 1190.
  - No Motion to bring in Bills under Standing Order No. 11, to be accepted during Remainder of Session, *July 13*, 1188.

[*cont.*

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*cont.*
- Business of the House
  - Course of, *July 10*, 739; *July 11*, 897–899.
  - Government Business to have Precedence until end of Session, and Adjournment of the House to be made without Question put, *July 13*, 1188–1190.
- Ceylon Pearl Fisheries, Conditions of leasing—Opportunity for Discussion, *July 5*, 217; *July 9*, 529.
- Colonial Conference, 1907—Imperial Preference, Opportunity for discussing, *July 16*, 1359.
- Colonial Marriages Bill, Proposals as to, *July 16*, 1321.
- Ecclesiastical Discipline
  - Commission Report, Opportunity for discussing, *July 12*, 1073.
  - Government Proposals for dealing with Question, *July 5*, 249.
- Education—Irish Intermediate Board and the Parliamentary Resolution, *July 10*, 738.
- Education Board Vote, Date of taking, *July 11*, 896.
- Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Acts proposed to be included in, *July 4*, 58.
- Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill—Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 4*, 63.
- Foreign Office Vote, Time allotted to, *July 12*, 1074.
- Gambling—Protection of Bank Stock, *July 9*, 499.
- Great Yarmouth Election Petition—Charges against Mr. Justice Grantham, etc.
  - Government Attitude, *July 4*, 59.
  - Political Bias and Partisanship, Charges of, *July 6*, 409–411.
- Home Rule, Irish, Legislative Proposals as to, *July 4*, 59.
- Indian Budget, Facilities for discussing, *July 10*, 739.
- Local Authorities (Qualifications of Women) Bill, *July 11*, 897.
- Merchant Shipping Bill, Date of taking, *July 10*, 739.
- Musical Copyright Bill, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 249.
- Natal Native Rising
  - Bambaata, Alleged Decapitation of Corpse of, *July 16*, 1360.
  - Zulu Wounded, Treatment of, *July 16*, 1360.
- Poor Law Commission, Irish Medical Representation on, *July 16*, 1321.
- Scottish Estimates, Opportunity for discussing, *July 9*, 529; *July 12*, 1073.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*cont.*
- Speeches, Duration of—Proposals for dealing with Question, *July 16*, 1359.
- Supply, Time allotted for, Inadequacy of, alleged, *July 13*, 1196.
- Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Eleven o'Clock Rule, Motion for Suspension of—Procedure as to, *July 5*, 252.
- Trade Disputes Bill, Government Attitude towards—Time for Discussion, etc., *July 13*, 1196.
- Weights, Measures and Currency—Adoption of Uniform System proposed, *July 16*, 1359.
- Welsh Church
  - Disestablishment, Proposals as to Procedure, *July 12*, 1072.
  - Inquiry, Reason for appointing, *July 11*, 895.
- Wireless Telegraphy Bill, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 530.

Camperdown, Earl of
- Autumn Session, Course of Business during, *July 5*, 189, 190.
- Business of the House—Measures promised in King's Speech—Information as to Date of bringing to the House of Lords, etc., *July 5*, 189, 190.
- London County Council
  - Electric Supply Undertakings, Excess of Expenditure over Estimate, *July 9*, 432–434.
  - Expenditure of, Enormous Increase in, *July 9*, 426–436.
  - Financial Committee—Recommendations of, ignored, alleged, *July 9*, 435–438.
  - Housing Schemes, Buildings, etc.—Excess of Expenditure over Estimate, etc., *July 9*, 434.
  - Loans, Borrowing Powers for £12,224,000, *July 9*, 428.
  - Steamboat Service, Excess of Expenditure over Estimate and Receipts, *July 9*, 429, 430.
  - Tramway Services, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates and Receipts, *July 9*, 430 ,431.
  - Undertakings of, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates, *July 9*, 428–435.
- London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 1251–1254, 1258, 1262, 1263.
- London County Council (Money) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 426–438, 442, 460.

Canals
- Royal Commission, Constitution of—Irish Representation, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 9*, 534.

Canned Foodstuffs

Australian, *see under* Australasia—Tinned Meat Trade.

Canterbury, Archbishop of

Tidworth Barracks—Hospital, Church and Recreation-room Accommodation, Proposals as to, *July 6,* 339.

Canterbury and Herne Bay

Light Railway Order, 1903—Order reviving Powers granted and extending Period for, Presented, *July 5,* 335, 353.

Cape Colony

Maraisburg Education Board, Alleged Dismissal of English Teachers by.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Arnold-Forster; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16,* 1328, 1329.

Cardiff Gas Bill

l. Rep. July 5,* 157.
3R.* *July 9,* 425.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 16,* 1297.

Cardiff Railway Bill

c. Rep. July 10,* 702.

Carlile, Mr. E. H. [Hertfordshire, St. Albans]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 4,* 587, 598, 831, 834.

Carlisle

Post Office—Duties of Telegraph Boys.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 6,* 354, 355.

Carriekerry

Postal Facilities, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 11,* 895.

Carrington, Earl—*President of the Board of Agriculture*

Horses, Breeding of — Government Assistance and Encouragement of, proposed, *July 16,* 1290–1294.

London County Council
- Expenditure of, Enormous Increase in, *July 9,* 460.
- Financial Methods of—*Status* of Credit, etc., *July 9,* 460–463.
- Housing Schemes, Buildings, etc.—Excess of Expenditure over Estimate, etc., *July 9,* 462.
- Loans, Borrowing Powers for £12,224,000, *July 9,* 461.

London County Council (Money) Bill, 2R., *July 9,* 460–463.

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H. [Dublin University]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 4,* 92, 93, 128–130, 144, 145; *July 9,* 536, 541, 548, 556, 557, 560, 589, 594, 623, 634–636; *July 10,* 773, 796, 797, 803, 828, 830, 831.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 9,* 649.

Labourers, Ireland, Advances—Resolution, *July 11,* 990.

Motor Omnibus Inspection, Regulations as to, *July 12,* 1172.

Post Office Sites Bill, *Com., July 16,* 1448, 1449, 1450.

Castlereagh, Lord [Maidstone]

Army
- Norwich Barracks Scheme, Decision as to, *July 10,* 713.
- *Personnel,* Reduction, Proposals as to, *July 12,* 1145, 1146.
- Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12,* 1143–1146.
- Tidworth Barracks Lighting Arrangements, *July 10,* 712.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 10,* 802.

Militia, Utilisation of, in certain branches of Regular Army Work, Proposals as to, *July 12,* 1144.

Cattle

Epizootic Abortion, Committee of Inquiry into, appointed.
Os. Sir E. Strachey, *July 13,* 1228.

Holland and Denmark, from, Removal of Importation Restrictions, proposed.
Os. Dr. Cooper, *July 13,* 1225, 1226; Sir E. Strachey, 1230.

Importation Restrictions, Removal of, proposed.
Os. Mr. G. Faber, *July 13,* 1226; Sir E. Strachey, 1230, 1231; Mr. Cairns, 1235, 1236.

Cavan

Evicted Tenants—Reinstatements, effected, etc.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16,* 1353.

Cave, Mr. G. [Surrey, Kingston]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 4,* 85, 101, 102; *July 9,* 535, 536, 563, 608, 609, 613, 617; *July 10,* 756, 757, 760, 829, 833.

Cawdor, Earl

Dissemination of News in War Time, Government Control over, etc., Introduction of Bill, proposed, *July 13,* 1180, 1181.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 124, 133–135; *July 9*, 450, 567, 574, 587, 594, 595, 634; *July 10*, 751, 754, 766, 767, 770, 771, 774, 780, 798, 823, 827; *July 11*, 944, 946.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 142, 143; *July 9*, 537, 617, 621–623.

Ceylon
  Education of Coolie Children, Proposals as to.
    Q. Sir C. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 10*, 716.
  Garrison in, Proposed Reduction of.
    Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1105.
  Pearl Fisheries, Conditions of leasing,
    Qs. Mr. J. D. White, Mr. Menzies; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 4*, 27, 28.
    Qs. Mr. Smeaton, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Lyttelton; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 5*, 216, 217.
    Q. Mr. J. Henderson; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 9*, 529.

Chairman and Deputy-Chairman, Rulings of
  Allegations made by Member which were out of order could not be answered by another Member, *July 13*, 1214.
  Amendments
    Priority of, *July 16*, 1480.
    Withdrawal of—Member to refrain from crying "Aye," *July 16*, 1486.
  "Ayes have it," Declaration made, *July 16*, 1470, 1473.
  "Disgraceful Language," Use of Expression in Debate, *July 5*, 267.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill
    Amendments which, taken together, constituted an alternative Clause, were not in order, *July 4*, 64, 65, 66.
    Matter outside Scope of Subject under Debate, *July 4*, 68, 144; *July 9*, 554, 598; *July 10*, 766, 771, 772, 773, 812, 813.
    Order of Debate, Rulings as to, *July 4*, 68, 69.
    Second Reading Speech on Committee Stage, was out of order, *July 10*, 813.
  Improper Method of addressing the Chair, *July 14*, 1450.
  Matter outside Scope of Subject under Debate, *July 13*, 1213, 1214, 1233, 1235; *July 16*, 1446, 1466.
  Member moving an Amendment was not entitled to offer Preliminary Remarks, *July 16*, 1452, 1453.

Chairman and Deputy-Chairman, Rulings of—*cont.*
  Motion having been divided on, no similar Motion could be accepted, *July 16*, 1479.
  Point of Order, Member speaking to, must be seated, *July 16*, 1485.
  Question put, Member rising subsequently, Procedure in case of, *July 10*, 818, 819, 820, 823.
  Repetition in Debate not allowable, *July 16*, 1450.
  Rulings must not be questioned, *July 16*. 1485.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
  Rt. Hon. Sir H. Fowler.

Chancellor of the Exchequer
  Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.

Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northants, E.]
  Motors
    Accidents caused by, in Metropolitan Area, *July 16*, 1313.
    Omnibuses, Regulations as to testing, *July 16*, 1315.

Charing Cross, West End and City Electricity Supply Bill
  c. Order for Second Reading, read, etc., and Bill withdrawn, *July 12*, 1027.

Chatham
  Luton School, Alleged Flogging of Children in—Prosecution of E. W. Lemmon, etc.
    Q. Mr. Barnes; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 1344.

Cheetham, Mr. J. F. [Stalybridge]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 928.

Cheltenham Gas Bill
  l. 3R.* *July 9*, 425.
  c. Lords' Amendts. *Con.** *July 13*, 1181.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Liverpool, Exchange]
  Belfast—Speech delivered by Rev. R. W. Patterson, *July 9*, 530, 531.
  Ennis Assizes, Cases heard at, Condition of County, etc., *July 10*, 728, 729.
  Galway Sessional Divisions, Alteration in, proposed, *July 11*, 882.
  Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Government Policy as to, Information regarding, *July 6*, 417, 418.

Chertsey Rural District
  Light Railways Construction in—Orders Presented, *July 5*, 335, 354.

Chesshire, Miss A. L.
Case of—Investigation of, proposed.
Qs. Dr. Cooper; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Burns, *July 12*, 1061.

Chester-le-Street
Vaccination Prosecution Case of R. Dixon.
Qs. Mr. J. W. Taylor; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Burns, *July 10*, 722, 724, 725.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. J. Bryce.

Children
Insurance—Legislation to limit Amount Payable, proposed.
Q. Mr. L. Haslam; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 1335.
Juvenile Offenders, *see that title.*
Poor Law, *see that title.*

China
Anhui Mining Final Contract, Enforcing Fulfilment of Terms of, etc.
Os. Sir E. Sassoon, *July 5*, 304, 305.
Chinanfu declared to be an Unhealthy Place within meaning of Superannuation Act—Treasury Minute Presented, *July 9*, 471, 480.
Hangchow—Trade Report Presented, *July 16*, 1275.
International Control over, Alleged Attempt of China to acquire Immunity from.
Os. Sir E. Sassoon, *July 5*, 302–306; Sir E. Grey, 325.
Punitive Methods prevailing in British Concessions—Allegations as to Flogging and us of the "Cangue."
Os. Mr. H. H. Marks, *July 5*, 253–258; Sir E. Grey, 326.

Chiozza-Money, Mr. L. G. [Paddington, N.]
Education—Citizenship, Proposals for teaching, *July 5*, 237.
Factory Inspectors, Distances travelled by, *July 12*, 1058.
Kew Gardens
Guide to, Preparation of, proposed, *July 16*, 1312.
Hours of Opening on Sunday, *July 5*, 240, 241.
Refreshments, Improvement in, proposed, *July 16*, 1312.
Sunday Morning Opening of, proposed, *July 12*, 1064.

Chippenham Rural District
Corsham Gas Provisional Order—Board of Trade Report, Presented, *July 9*, 471, 481.

Church Discipline Bill
c. 1R.* *July 6*, 423.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*Under-Secretary for the Colonies* [Manchester, N.W.]
Africa, Central
Forest Conservation, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 213.
Labour Recruitment in the Lake Province, *July 4*, 14.
Africa, East
British Indians, Settlement Rights of *July 5*, 218.
Labour Recruiting Licences, Issue of, *July 16*, 1330.
Legislative Council, Proposals as to, *July 16*, 1327.
Africa, South
Convict and Prison Labour System, *July 10*, 706.
Cotton Goods shipped before Increased Duty was made known, Duty payable on, *July 16*, 1331.
Customs Tariff, New, Procedure in ratifying, *July 12*, 1049.
Milk, Skimmed, Condensed, Import Duty on, *July 9*, 490.
Self-Government Proposals, Opportunity for discussing, etc., *July 9*, 482.
White Population, Measures taken for Protection of, *July 12*, 1048.
Australia
Mail Service, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 505.
Tinned Meat Trade, Regulations for, *July 9*, 488.
Cape Colony—Maraisburg School Board, Alleged Dismissal of English Teachers by, *July 16*, 1328, 1329.
Ceylon
Education of Coolie Children, *July 10*, 716.
Pearl Fisheries, Conditions of Leasing, *July 4*, 28; *July 5*, 216.
Emigration Office, Proposals as to Reorganising, etc., *July 16*, 1332.
Malta—Protestant Mission Services, Discontinuance of—Tabling Correspondence, proposed, *July 5*, 219, 220; *July 16*, 1331.
Natal
Bill of Indemnity, Provisions of, *July 16*, 1326.
Native Rising
Casualties among White and Black Forces, *July 5*, 214, 215; *July 12*, 1052.
Native Prisoners, Treatment of, *July 11*, 872, 873.
White Man Murdered in Mesini's Kraal, Discovery of, *July 9*, 508.

[*cont.*

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*
- Nigeria
  - Chief Nana, Decision as to Return of, *July 16*, 1328.
  - Railway Extension, Decision as to, *July 12*, 1050.
- Opium-Farming in Malay States, Singapore, and Hong Kong—Revision of System, proposed, *July 16*, 1327.
- Singapore Docks, Cost of Acquiring, *July 11*, 869; *July 12*, 1038.
- Transvaal
  - British Indians, Rights of, Use of Word "Native" to designate, etc., *July 12*, 1050; *July 16*, 1330.
  - Chinese Labourers
    - Botha, General, Letter from and Reply to, *July 9*, 505.
    - Cason Mine—Charges against Mr. Jamieson, *July 11*, 871.
    - Corporal Punishment
      - New Comet Mine Case, Information as to, *July 4*, 27.
      - Witthauer, Decision as to Prosecuting, *July 4*, 27.
    - Crimes
      - Protection of White People, Measures for, etc., *July 11*, 870.
      - Sentences for, etc., *July 11*, 868.
      - Statistics as to, *July 9*, 507; *July 11*, 873, 874.
    - Desertions, Number of, *July 5*, 213.
    - Existing Contracts, Compensation for Cancelling, proposed, *July 12*, 1051.
    - Importation, Date of Stopping, *July 5*, 211; *July 12*, 1052.
    - Licences, Information as to, *July 12*, 1051.
    - Nourse Deep Mine Riot, Information as to, *July 11*, 870.
    - Repatriation
      - Amended Notification, Particulars of, *July 5*, 211.
      - Local Opinion, Resolutions received, etc., *July 9*, 508.
      - 'Tremblingly Obey'—Use of Term in Notification, *July 4*, 24–26.
    - Statistics as to, *July 5*, 212, 213.
  - Gaols, White Men, Kaffirs, and Chinese in, *July 12*, 1053.
  - Import Statistics, Return as to, proposed, *July 12*, 1049.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*
- Transvaal—*cont.*
  - Japanese Rights and Privileges in, *July 16*, 1329.
  - Johannesburg, alleged School for Chinamen in, *July 12*, 1053.
  - Native Labour
    - Crimes, Statistics and Returns as to, *July 9*, 507; *July 12*, 1049.
    - Kaffir Employment Statistics, *July 9*, 506.
    - Recruitment, Encouragement of, proposed, *July 12*, 1051.
    - Wages in Certain Years, *July 12*, 1050.
  - Northern Railway Bonds, Value of, *July 4*, 26.
  - Rand—Information as to alleged Outrage on White People by Kaffirs and Chinese, *July 16*, 1329.
  - White Labour Employed in Mines, *July 9*, 506.
- Zanzibar Mainland, proposals for Abolishing Slavery on, *July 16*, 1332.

City of London Electric Lighting Bill
- c. Order for Second Reading Read, etc., and Bill Withdrawn, *July 12*, 1027.

Civil Service
- Abstractor Clerks—Regulations as to Counting Service for Pensions.
  - *Q.* Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 4*, 37.
- Boy Clerks
  - Appointments, Dismissals, etc., of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. McKenna *July 16*, 1309, 1310.
  - May Examination, Result of—Date of next Examination, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 4*, 20.
- Superannuation
  - Appointments without Certificate through Inadvertence—Treasury Minute, Presented, *July 16*, 1275, 1299.
  - Chinanfu declared an Unhealthy Place—Treasury Minute, Presented, *July 9*, 471, 480.
  - Vote for, *July 13*, 1237.

Civil Service Estimates
- Agriculture and Fisheries Board, Salaries and Expenses — £75,335, *Com.*, *July 13*, 1209.
- Foreign Affairs, Department, Salaries and Expenses — £40,396, *Com.*, *July 5*, 253.
- Ireland—Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department — £110,146, *Rep.** *July 13*, 1238.

[*cont.*

Civil Service Estimates—*cont.*
Papers relating to, Absence of—Motion to Report Progress.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, Mr. Buxton, *July 13,* 1209.
Police, Salaries and Expenses—£26,953, *Rep.* July 13,* 1240.
Post Office, including Telegraphs — £10,496,741, *Rep.* July 13,* 1238.
Superannuation, Compensation and Gratuities and Salaries of Medical Referees —£358,969, *Rep.* July 13,* 1237.
Trustee, Post Office and Friendly Societies' Savings Banks, Deficiencies on— £122,644, *Rep.* July 13,* 1237.

Clacton Urban District Council Bill
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 5,* 158.

Clancy, Mr. J. Y. [Dublin County, N.]
Historical Manuscripts—Allocation of Printing Contracts, *July 12,* 1042.
Post Office Contracts, Irish, Inspection of, *July 12,* 1071.

Clanricarde Estate
Reinstatement Claim of P. Fahy.
Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9,* 484.

Clare
Constabulary Force, Reduction of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Halpin; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10,* 734.

Cleggan
Letter Box, Erection of, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 9,* 483.

Cleland, Mr. J. W. [Glasgow, Bridgeton]
Civil Service Abstractor Clerks—Regulations as to Counting Service for Pensions, *July 4,* 37.

Clifden
Bridewell, Cost of, Number of Persons Detained in, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16,* 1319.

Clinton, Lord
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 3R., *July 16,* 1263–1265.

Closetoken
Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Duffy.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9,* 533.

Clough, Mr. W. [Yorks., W.R., Skipton]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 10,* 765, 792.

Coal
Rating—Inquiry into present System, proposed.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 9,* 496.

Coal—*cont.*
Trade Reports (1904 and 1905) Extracts relating to—Return Presented, *July 16,* 1300.

Coal Mines
Inspection of — Decision as to Welsh Mines, etc.
Qs. Mr. J. Williams, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 4,* 31, 32.

Coinage and Currency
Uniform System for British Empire Investigation of Question, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16,* 1359.

Collins, Mr. S. [Lambeth, Kennington]
Leckhampton Right of Way disturbances—Sentences Inflicted, etc., *July 11,* 875.

Collins, Sir W. J. [St. Pancras, W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 16,* 1386, 1387.
Vaccine Establishment, National—Source of Supply of Lymph, *July 4,* 21.

Colonial Conference, 1907
Imperial Preference, Opportunity for Discussing.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16,* 1358.

Colonial Marriages Bill
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Lea; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16,* 1321.

Colonial Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. W. Churchill.

Colonies and Protectorates
[*See also* names of Colonies, etc.]
Emigration Office, proposals as to Reorganising, etc.
Q. Sir J. Dickson-Poynder; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16,* 1332.
Report, Annual, Presented, *July 10,* 655, 704.

Columbia
Accession of, to Geneva Convention, *July 9,* 470, 481.

Commerce
See Trade and Commerce.
Police and Sanitary Committee Report Presented, *July 12,* 1074.

Companies (Winding-up)
General Annual Report, Presented, *July 4,* 7; *July 5,* 161.

Compulsory Military Service
German System
Os. Earl of Portsmouth, *July 10*, 679, 680; Viscount Milner, 686, 687.
Possibility of Establishing.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1082.
Proposals as to—Cost of the Scheme, etc.
Os. Earl of Dundonald, *July 10*, 667, 668; Earl of Portsmouth, 676–682, 689; Viscount Milner, 682–689; Lord Lovat, 689; Lord Grimthorpe, 690–692, 694; Marquess of Lansdown, 696; Marquess of Ripon, 699, 700.

Congested Districts Board (Ireland)
Land Purchases, Price paid, etc.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 46.
Records of Lands Purchased, etc., Confidential Nature of.
Qs. Mr. J. Roche, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 43–45.

Congo Free State
Belgian Administration of—Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives, etc.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 5*, 258–266; Mr. M'Kean, 266–279; Sir C. Dilke, 276, 281, 282–286; Earl Percy, 294–298; Mr. Bennett, 306–309; Sir E. Grey, 318–324.
Armstrong, Vice-Consul, Tabling Report of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Bennett; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 1305.
Berlin Act.
International Commission for Congo Navigation, Power to set up.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 5*, 285, 286; Sir E. Grey, 323.
Intervention of European Powers under, Powers as to.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 5*, 259, 261–263; Sir E. Grey, 262; Mr. McKean, 266, 268, 270, 273; Sir C. Dilke, *July 5*, 283–285; Earl Percy, 294, 295, 297; Mr. Bennett, 308, 309; Sir E. Grey, 322.
Constitution and Work of Second Commission.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 5*, 296.
Consular Courts, Right of Great Britain to Establish.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 5*, 261, 265; Mr. Bennett, 309; Sir E. Grey, 323.
Decrees Issued, Terms of.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 5*, 298; Sir E. Grey, 321.

Congo Free State—*cont.*
Belgian Administration—*cont.*
Labour, Conditions of, Decree as to,
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 5*, 260, 261; Mr. McKean, 268; Sir E. Grey, 321.
Origin of—Declarations of International Association of the Congo.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 5*, 259; Sir E. Grey, 318.
Proclamation Issued by King of the Belgians.
Os. Sir G. Parker, *July 5*, 258, 259; Mr. McKean, 267, 268; Sir C. Dilke, 285.
Public Opinion in Belgium, *July 5*, 259; Sir C. Dilke, 282, 283; Sir E. Grey, 323.
Report and Recommendations of Commissions.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 5*, 295–297; Sir E. Grey, 318, 319.
Stannard, Rev. E., Sentence passed on.
Q. Mr. Bennett; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 1305.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
[*See also names of places.*]
Cryan, Constable, Charges against, in Carroll Case—Offer to Pay Damages in Instalments, etc.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1068.
Wade, District Inspector—Allowance for Manservant.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1349.

Connaught & Strathearn, H.R.H. Duke of
Took the Oath, *July 13*, 1173.

Conveyancing Bill
l. Com., *July 5*, 162.
Rep. July 6*, 350.
3R.* *July 16*, 1276.
Amendments made by Select Committee.
Os. Lord Davey, *July 5*, 162.

Coolkill
Coyle, Mrs., Reinstatement Claim of.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1355.
Reilly, F., Reinstatement Claim of.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1042.

Cooper, Dr. G. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
Bermondsey, Unemployment in, owing to Cattle Exclusion Regulations, *July 13*, 1224.
Cattle from Holland and Denmark, removal of Importation Restriction proposed, *July 13*, 1225, 1226.
Chesshire, Miss A. L., Case of—Inquiry proposed, *July 12*, 1061.
Deptford Cattle Market, Effect of Closing to Foreign Cattle, *July 12*, 1065; *July 13*, 1224.

[*cont.*

Cooper, Dr. G.—*cont.*
Race Meetings, Employment of Metropolitan Police at, *July 10*, 720, 721.
Sutton—Outbreak of Enteric Fever at Belmont Imbecile Asylum, *July 4*, 35; *July 9*, 521.
Women, Enfranchisement of—Disturbance in Cavendish Square, Sentence on Suffragettes, etc., *July 5*, 331.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
Belfast—Speech delivered by Rev. R. D. Patterson, *July 9*, 531.
Labourers, Ireland—Advances, Resolution, *July 9*, 651.
Malta—Discontinuance of Protestant Mission Services, *July 5*, 218–220; *July 16*, 1331.
Monastic and Conventual Institutions—Conditions of Permission to use Private Burying Grounds, *July 5*, 230, 231.
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com. July 16*, 1449.

Cork
Agriculture Department Schemes put into operation.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 4, 6, 47.

Cork City Railways and Works Bill
l. 2R.* *July 5*, 158.

Cornamona
School Teacher—Decision in Case of Mr. M. O'Malley.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 888.

Cornwall
Parliamentary Election for Bodmin—New Writ, Motion for.
Os. Mr. G. Whiteley, *July 5*, 252, 253; Mr. Speaker, 252, 253; Mr. S. MacNeill, 253.

Corporeal Punishment
Sentences inflicted (1905), Return Presented *July 16*, 1298.

Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 6*, 334.
3R. *July 16*, 1269.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]
Assam—Udoya Patni, Alleged Hanging of, after sending in Appeal, *July 10*, 718.
India—Eastern Bengal
"Bande Mataram"—Mahommedan Opinion on, *July 16*, 1324.
Partition of—Local Opinion, etc., *July 5*, 222.
Swadeshi Movement—Alleged Repressive Measures against, *July 5*, 221.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S.—*cont.*
Transvaal, Chinese Labourers Repatriation—"Tremblingly obey," Use of Term, Wording of Original Draft, etc., *July 4*, 23–25.

County Courts
Plaints and Sittings, Return as to, ordered, *July 9*, 481; Presented, *July 13*, 1183.

County of Durham Electric Power Supply Bill
c. Rep. July 12*, 1028.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]
Education—Age Limit for Commencing, Alteration in, proposed, *July 16*, 1344.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com. July 11*, 963–966.
India
Budget, Opportunity for Discussing in Viceregal Council, *July 9*, 510.
Moral and Material Progress—Discontinuance of Annual Statement, proposed, *July 9*, 509.
Transvaal
British Indians, Rights of, Use of Word "Native" to designate, *July 12*, 1050; *July 16*, 1330.
Japanese Rights and Privileges in, *July 16*, 1329.
Weights, Measures and Currency—Adoption of Uniform System, proposed, *July 16*, 1359.

Craig, Capt. J. [Down, E.]
Army Candidates from Universities, revision of Regulations as to, proposed, *July 11*, 867.
Dundrum Inner Bay Crossing, Erection of Bridge at, proposed, *July 10*, 729.
Ellis Estate Cattle Mutilation Case—Measures taken for Discovery of Miscreants, etc., *July 10*, 737.
Home Rule, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 733.
House of Commons Kitchen Committee, Laundries employed by, *July 10*, 726.
King's County Assizes—Crier's Fee in Case of Young *v.* Brennan, *July 10*, 733.
Labourers, Ireland, Advances—Resolution, *July 16*, 1444, 1445.
Poor Law Commission, Irish Medical Representation on, *July 16*, 1321.
Tyrone, East, New Writ for—Motion for issue, *July 6*, 368.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill—Government Policy, Information regarding, *July 6*, 415.
Tyrone, East, New Writ for—Motion for Issue, *July 6*, 367, 368.

Craik, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com. July 9*, 538, 539; *July 10*, 811–814, 817; *July 11*, 951; *July 16*, 1387, 1388.
    Teachers—Compensation for Discharge, *July 13*, 1188.

Craughwell
  Ryan, Mrs., Stone thrown at Window of.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 888.

Crean, Mr. E. [Cork, S.E.]
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Com., July 4*, 156; *July 11*, 1458, 1479, 1484, 1485.

Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
  Women, Enfranchisement of—Disturbance in Cavendish Square, Sentence on Suffragettes, etc., *July 5*, 332.

Crewe, Earl of—*Lord President of the Council*
  Autumn Session, proposals as to, *July 5*, 194–197.
  Business of the House—Measures promised in King's Speech, Information as to, Date of bringing to the House of Lords, etc., *July 5*, 196.
  Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill, 3R. *July 16*, 1273
  Education (England and Wales) Bill—Date of Introduction in the House of Lords—Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 195, 196.
  Magistrates, Ireland
    Appointments during last Twelve months—Return as to, proposed, *July 12*, 1024.
    Disloyal Speeches by, Inciting to Illegal and Criminal Acts—Attitude of H.M. Government, *July 12*, 1023, 1024.
    Procedure as to Appointment of, *July 12*, 1023.

Crimes and Criminal Offences
  Death Sentences passed (1851–1900).
    Qs. Mr. Essex; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 10*, 724; *July 16*, 1312, 1314.

Criminal Appeal Bill
  l. Rep. July 10, 656.
    3R. *July 12*, 1002.
  Debate on Third Reading (Lords), *July 12*, 1002.
    Criminal Cases, Right of Appeal in.
      Conviction of Person, in his Absence, of Crime not charged at Original Hearing, Objections to, 1005, 1006, 1007.
      Convictions on Indictment, Right of Appeal on Fact, in Cases of, 1003.

Criminal Appeal Bill—*cont.*
  Debate on Third Reading—*cont.*
    Criminal Cases—*cont.*
      Prosecutor, Absence of Provision for dealing with, 1003, 1004, 1006.
      Release on Bail of Persons having Right of Appeal, Absence of Provision for, 1003, 1006.
    Expenses of carrying out Act, 1008.
    Juries, Objections to Interference with Responsibility of, 1008.
    Legal Assistance, Provision as to, 1004.
    Restitution of Goods after Appeal, Absence of Provision for, 1003.
    Witnesses on Appeal, Absence of Provision for binding over, 1004, 1006.

Crofters Act Amendment Bill
  Date of Introducing.
    Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 11*, 858.

Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire]
  Scottish Estimates, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 9*, 529.
  Yeomanry, Lothian and Berwickshire—Appointment of Lord Binning to command, *July 12*, 1036.

Crown Lands
  Recovery of Crown Rents—Resolution (Mr. McKenna) *July 16*, 1445.
    Os. Mr. C. Hay, Mr. McKenna, Mr. W. Rutherford, Mr. Field, *July 16*, 1446.

Crown Office
  Rules (1906), Presented, *July 12*, 995, 1030.

Cruelty to Animals (No. 2) Bill
  c. 1R.* *July 6*, 423.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]
  King-Harman Estate—Terms of Purchase for Ballinamuck Portion, *July 5*, 248.
  Thompson (Clonfin) Estate, Purchase Negotiations for, *July 5*, 247.

Cumberland Electricity and Power Gas Bill
  c. Rep. July 5*, 198.
    Con. July 11*, 853.
    3R.* *July 16*, 1296.

Custom House Quay
  Decision as to utilising as Extension of Billingsgate Market.
    Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 16*, 1303.
    Q. Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 16*, 1334.

Customs and Excise

Statistical Office New Class Assistant Clerks, Decision as to Memorial from.
Q. Mr. Thornton; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 16*, 1310.

Supervisorship Examinations, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 9*, 491, 492.

Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]

Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill—Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 4*, 64.

Natal Native Rising, Information as to, *July 16*, 1360.

Darcy Estate

Grazing Farm, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1303.

Dartmoor

Artillery Practice on Public Holidays, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Luttrell; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9*, 488.

Dartmoor, Earl of

Lichfield Barracks, Accommodation for Married Soldiers, Inadequacy of, *July 9*, 476, 477.

Davey, Lord

Conveyancing Bill—Amendments made by Select Committee, *July 5*, 162.

Married Women's Property Bill—Amendments made by Select Committee, *July 5*, 163.

Settled Land Bill—Amendments made by Select Committee, *July 5*, 163.

Davies, Mr. T. [Fulham]

Custom House Quay—Decision as to utilising as Extension to Billingsgate Market, *July 16*, 1334.

Lost Property, Procedure in paying Rewards for finding, *July 4*, 32.

Mall to Charing Cross—Proposals as to Spring Gardens Entrance, etc., *July 4*, 37.

Police, Metropolitan, Weekly Day of Rest for, proposed, *July 16*, 1337.

Davies, Mr. T. H. [Hackney, N.]

India—Guzerat and the Deccan, Rainfall and Monsoon Forecast for, *July 10*, 711.

Navy, New Training Scheme—Report by Italian Minister of Marine, *July 9*, 500.

Police, Metropolitan—Sunday Duty and Annual Holiday, *July 5*, 230.

Volunteers, Inns of Court Rifle—Regulation as to Admission of Indian Law Students, *July 4*, 13.

Deane-Drake Estate

Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Kavanagh.
Qs. Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 242, 243.

Deanery of Manchester Bill

c. 1R.* *July 16*, 1360.

Deaths

Annual Lists for Parliamentary Registration Purposes, Remuneration for furnishing, etc.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr Bryce, *July 5*, 206, 207.

Defence of the Empire

Auxiliary Forces—Unfitness for Home Defence.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10*, 663–666.

Colonial Reserve, Establishment of, proposed.
Os. Earl of Dundonald, *July 10*, 670, 671.

Committee of Defence, Valuable Work of.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1078; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1158.

Compulsory Military Service, *see that title*

Dissemination of News in War Time, Government Control over, etc.—Introduction of Bill, proposed.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 13*, 1174–1179; Lord Tweedmouth, 1179, 1180; Earl Cawdor, 1180, 1181.

Expansion Outside Limit of Regular Forces, Necessity for.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10*, 656, 664; Earl of Portsmouth, 673, 674, 681; Lord Grimthorpe, 693; Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1081, 1117, 1166; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1120, 1123; Sir J. Dickson-Poynder, 1139; Mr. A. L. Lever, 1152.

History of Military and Naval Campaigns undertaken by Great Britain.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10*, 657–661.

Navy as sole Means of—Supplementing by increased Land Defences, proposed.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10*, 658; Marquess of Lansdowne, 696, 698; Marquess of Ripon, 698, 699; Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1080.

Unpreparedness of the Nation for War, alleged.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10*, 656–658, 661–667, 673; Earl of Portsmouth, 672–675; Marquess of Lansdowne, 697.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]

Adair Estate—Reinstatement Claim of T. Flanagan, *July 9*, 483.

Agricultural Organisation Association

Founder of, etc., *July 9*, 498.

Grants to, *July 10*, 734.

Caldbeck Estate, Purchase Negotiations for, *July 16*, 1320.

Congested Districts Inquiry—Scope of Commission, *July 10*, 734.

Cryan, Constable, Charges against in Carroll Case, etc., *July 12*, 1068.

Dublin—Kingbridge Telegraph Office Staff Accommodation for taking Meals, *July 10*, 738.

Limerick Post Office Learner, Reason for Resignation of, *July 10*, 737.

Sandes Estate, Purchase Proposals for, *July 12*, 1041.

Delmege Estate

Purchase of, and Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.

Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 893, 894.

Denman, Lord

Ancient Order of Hibernians, Seditious Actions of, Connection with United Irish League, *July 12*, 1019.

Magistrates—Ireland.

Appointments during last Twelve Months—Return as to, proposed, *July 12*, 1018, 1021.

Disloyal Speeches by, Inciting to Illegal and Criminal Acts—Attitude of His Majesty's Government, *July 12*, 1017–1019.

Procedure as to Appointment of, *July 12*, 1020.

Deptford

Cattle Market, Effect of Closing to Foreign Cattle.

Os. Dr. Cooper, *July 13*, 1224.

Q. Dr. Cooper; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 12*, 1065.

Derby Gas Bill

l. Rep. July 16*, 1241.

Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Bill

l. Rep. July 10*, 653.

3R.* *July 13*, 1173.

Devlin, Mr. C. R. [Galway]

Barna Estate, Purchase of, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, etc., *July 10*, 736.

Barna Pier, Inspection of, proposed, *July 11*, 892.

Canadian Mails, Sending by Allan Line, proposed, *July 11*, 879.

Galway Sessional Divisions, Alteration in proposed, *July 11*, 882.

Devlin, Mr. C. R.—*cont.*

Labourers (Ireland) Bill, Extension of, to Urban Districts, proposed, *July 9*, 500.

Post Office Mail Service, American—Payment to German Vessels for Carriage of British Mails, *July 4*, 33.

Dewar, Mr. A. [Edinburgh, S]

Great Yarmouth Parliamentary Election Petition.

Proceedings at Trial, Allegations against Mr. Justice Grantham, *July 6*, 387–391.

Dewar, Mr. J. A. [Inverness]

Postal Employees joining Volunteers, Regulations as to, *July 10*, 705.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. [Wilts Chippenham]

Army

Expansion, Necessity for, *July 12*, 1139.

Expenditure, Total, *July 12*, 1140.

Guards, Reduction in Strength of, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1140.

Linked Battalion System, Defects of, *July 12*, 1141.

Personnel

Reduction in, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1139–1141, 1143.

Oversea Requirements the Determining Factor, *July 12*, 1141.

Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1139–1143.

Emigration Office, Proposals as to Reorganising, etc., *July 16*, 1332.

Volunteers

Functions of—New Scheme for a Territorial Army, *July 12*, 1141–1143.

Organisation of by Means of County Associations, proposed, *July 12*, 1142, 1143.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]

Abyssinian Railway, Progress of Negotiations as to, *July 5*, 225; *July 12*, 1053.

Army

Artillery—Number of Guns required for a Battery, *July 12*, 1132, 1133.

Cardwell System, *July 12*, 1131.

Expeditionary Force, Strength and Composition of, *July 12*, 1133, 1134.

Expenditure, Total, *July 12*, 1129.

Guards

Average Cost per man, *July 12*, 1130.

Reduction in Strength of, proposals as to, *July 12*, 1130.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W.—*cont.*
  Army—*cont.*
    Infantry—Supplementing from the Militia, proposals as to, *July 12*, 1130.
    Linked Battalion System, Defects of, *July 12*, 1131, 1132.
    Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1127–1137.
      Opportunity for Adequate Discussion of prior to carrying into effect, *July 12*, 1127, 1136.
    Separation of Indian Army from Home Army proposed, *July 12*, 1130.
  Congo Free State—Belgian Administration of—Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives, etc., *July 5*, 276, 281, 282–286.
    Berlin Act, International Commission for Congo Navigation, Power to set up, under, *July 5*, 285, 286.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill—Voluntary Schools Transferred, Position of, *July 6*, 356.
  Egypt—British Officers, Attack on—Execution, and Flogging of Natives, Allegations as to Method of carrying out, etc., *July 5*, 281, 282.
  Foreign Office, Vote for—Inadequate time granted for Discussion, *July 5*, 279.
  Militia
    Foreign Service for, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1134.
    Reorganisation proposals, *July 12*, 1134.
  New Hebrides, Decision as to—Action of the Foreign Office, *July 5*, 280.
  Russia
    Anti-Semitic Disturbances in, Intervention by Great Britain, proposed. *July 5*, 280, 281, 291.
    British Fleet, Visit of, during Manœuvres, Objections to, *July 5*, 280, 281.
  Volunteers
    Functions of—New Scheme for a Territorial Army, *July 12*, 1135–1137.
    Organisation of by means of County Associations proposed, *July 12*, 1135, 1136.
  Yeomanry — Divisional Troops, Utilisation as, on Mobilisation, proposals as to, *July 12*, 1134.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
  Agricultural Organisation Association, Payments to, *July 9*, 498.
  Dipton Catholic School, proposals as to, *July 4*, 37.

Dillon, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Education—Consultative Committee, Work of, *July 4*, 50.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 65, 68, 69, 72, 74, 86, 109.
  Egypt
    British Officers, Attack on
      Circumstances of, *July 5*, 312–314.
      Execution and Flogging of Natives, Allegations as to Method of carrying out, etc., *July 5*, 310, 311, 315.
      Papers, Date of Tabling and punitive Measures adopted against Village of Denshawi, *July 16*, 1305.
      Proceedings at Trial of, *July 5*, 225, 227, 228.
    Condition of, Revival of Fanatical Feeling against Europeans, etc., *July 5*, 310.
    El Azhar University Police Force, Reason for Increasing, *July 16*, 1306.
    Pigeon-shooting, Regulations as to, *July 9*, 487.
    Sersena, Inquiry into Death of Native near — Charges against British Soldiers, etc., *July 16*, 1304.

Dipton
  Catholic School, Result of Inquiry into proposals for.
    Qs. Mr. MacVeagh; Mr. Dillon; *As.* Mr. Lough, *July 4*, 36, 37

Dodd, Sergeant W. H. [Tyrone, N.]
  Tyrone, East, New Writ for—Motion for Issue of, *July 6*, 364–367.

Dog Licences
  Assessment
    Information as to.
      Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 11*, 874, 875.
    Officials responsible for Assessment, Effect of Acts of 1867 and 1869.
      Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 4*, 29, 30.
      Qs. Mr. Sears; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 5*, 239, 240.

Dogs Bill
  Exemption, Procedure in claiming.
    Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 12*, 1063, 1064.

Dogs Protection (No. 2) Bill
  c. 1R.* *July 6*, 424.

Dogs Regulation (Ireland) Act, 1865.
  Account of Receipts and Expenditure, Presented, *July 4*, 7; *July 5*, 161.

Dolan, Mr. [Leitrim, N.]
Aghanlish—Decision in Case of P. McGlone, *July 16*, 1306.

Donaghmore Glebe
National School, Reason for Withdrawal of Grants from.
Q. Mr. J. Campbell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 56.

Donelan, Capt. A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
Lunacy Grants, Effect of Proposed Change in System of Paying, *July 4*, 53, 54.
Ordnance Survey, Irish—Place of printing Maps, *July 16*, 1346, 1347.

Donoughmore, Earl of
Army
Mobilisation of, in event of War, Arrangements for, *July 9*, 476.
Tidworth Barracks — Hospital, Church and Recreation-room Accommodation, Proposals as to, *July 6*, 339.
Horse-breeding — Carrying out Recommendations of Royal Commission on, proposed.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 16*, 1276–1283.
London County Council
Financial Methods of—*Status* of Credit, etc., *July 9*, 456–459.
Undertakings of, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates, *July 9*, 457, 458.
London County Council (Money) Bill, 2r., *July 9*, 456–459.

Douglas Estate
Reinstatement of Mrs. K. Scanlan.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 894, 895.

Dover Corporation Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 5*, 198.
3r.* *July 9*, 478.

Dover Harbour (Works, &c.) Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 5*, 157.
3r.* *July 9*, 425.
c. 1r.* *July 9*, 479.

Dowlais Gas Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 9*, 478.

Dring
Telegraph Extension, Progress made with.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 4*, 57.

Dromahane
Reinstatement of Mrs. O'Regan.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 40, 41.

Dromod
Police Hut, Abolition of, proposed.
Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1069, 1070.

Drumcoo
Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. E. M'Guire.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1041, 1042.

Drumraney
Cassells, J., Alleged Attack on House of.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1068.

Dublin
Corporation
Irish Language, Use of, on Rolling Stock.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce *July 12*, 1034, 1035.
Refusal of Access of Local Government Auditor to Books, alleged.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 894.
Kingbridge Telegraph Office Staff—Accommodation for taking Meals.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 10*, 738.

Dublin, Wicklow and Wexford Railway Bill
l. 3r.* *July 6*, 334.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con., July 12*, 1027.

Duffy, Mr. W. J. [Galway, S.]
Closetoken—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Duffy, *July 9*, 533.
Darcy Estate Grazing Farm, Disposal of, *July 16*, 1303.
Kinvara Harbour Works, Decision as to, *July 9*, 531, 532.
Lewis Estate Sale Negotiations, *July 10*, 730.
Martyn Estate—Disposal of Cooks Town Farm, *July 10*, 730.
Lamberts Minors Estate, Proposals for Sale of, *July 16*, 1307.
Leefin Grazing Farm, Disposal of, *July 16*, 1302.
Loughrea Town Hall, Ownership and Use of, *July 12*, 1034.
Roo Estate
Enlargement of Holdings, proposed, *July 16*, 1307.
Untenanted Lands, Disposal of, *July 12*, 1070.

Duncan, Mr. C. [Barrow-in-Furness]
Women, Enfranchisement of—Disturbance in Cavendish Square, Sentence on Suffragettes, etc., *July 5*, 332.

Dundonald, Earl of
- Army
  - Officers
    - Shortage in, Proposals as to dealing with, *July 10*, 668–669.
    - System of Education in Public Schools, Unpractical Nature of, *July 10*, 669.
    - Reserve, Strengthening, Necessity for, *July 10*, 667, 670.
- Compulsory Military Service, and Proposals as to—Cost of the Scheme, etc., *July 10*, 667, 668.
- Defence of the Empire—Colonial Reserve Establishment of, proposed, *July 10*, 670, 671.
- South African War—Medals for Colonial Troops not actually employed on Active Service—Decision as to, *July 10*, 671, 672.

Dundrum
- Inner Bay Crossing, Erection of Bridge at, proposed.
  - *Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 729.

Dungarvan
- Causeway to Cunnigar, Decision as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shee; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1320.

Dunmore
- Purchase Negotiations for.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 890.

Dunraven, Earl of
- Horses, breeding of—Government Assistance and Encouragement of, proposed, *July 16*, 1289, 1290.

Easter Ross
- Sheep Farms converted in to Deer Forest, Names of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 5*, 242.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners
- Estates, Liquor Licences on, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. A. Henderson; *As.* Mr. C. Hobhouse, *July 5*, 241, 242.
  - *Qs.* Mr. A. Henderson, Mr. L. Jones, *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *July 12*, 1066.

Ecclesiastical Discipline
- Commission Report
  - Houses of Laymen, Legal *Status* of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Paul; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 5*, 232.
  - Opportunity for discussing.
    - *Qs.* Mr. A. Taylor; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 12*, 1073.
  - Presented, *July 13*, 1174, 1184.

Ecclesiastical Discipline—*cont.*
- Government Proposals for dealing with Question.
  - *Q.* Mr. Byles; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 5*, 249.
- Recommendation as to Meeting of Two Convocations, Legal Aspect of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Paul; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *July 12*, 1073.

Ecclesiastical Disorders (No. 2) Bill
- c. 1R.* *July 16*, 1361.

Education, Board of
- *President—Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.*
- Library at St. Stephen's House, Preparation of Catalogue of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Thomasson; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 10*, 706.
- Staff, Proposals for increasing.
  - *Q.* Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 11*, 863.
- Vote, Date of taking.
  - *Q.* Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 896.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Devon, &c.) Bill
- c. *Rep.** *July 12*, 1028.
- 3R.* *July 13*, 1182.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Kesteven, &c.) Bill
- c. 3R.* *July 13*, 1182.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) (No. 1) Bill
- c. *Rep.** *July 12*, 1028.
- *Con.** *July 13*, 1182.
- 3R.* *July 16*, 1297.

Education, England and Wales
- *See also names of places.*
- Age Limit for commencing, Alteration in, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 1344.
- Agricultural Instruction, Facilities for.
  - *Q.* Colonel Harrison-Broadley; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 523.
- Boroughs and Urban Districts with Population of £5,000 in which there are no Council Schools—List presented, *July 4*, 7; *July 5*, 161.
- Citizenship, Proposals for teaching.
  - *Q.* Mr. Chiozza-Money; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 5*, 237.
- Code—Article 38 (iv.) Interpretation of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 12*, 1040.
- Cost in Heavily-rated Areas—Work of Committee of Inquiry.
  - *Q.* Dr. Macnamara; *A* Mr. Birrell, *July 11*, 879, 880
- Fire Drill, Regulations as to counting Time spent in.
  - *Q.* Mr. Yoxall; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 12*, 1039.

[*cont.*

Education, England and Wales—*cont.*
- General Return (1904-5), Date of Presenting.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 4*, 20.
- Grants available for 1906-7.
  - *Q.* Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 11*, 880.
- Medical Inspection of Children, Proposals as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Alden, Mr. Thorne; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 523, 524.
- Medical Officers appointed by Local Education Authorities.
  - *Q.* Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 11*, 880.
- Schools Promoted by other than Local Education Authorities, Number of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Walrond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 494.
- Secondary and Technical Schools—Regulations (1906-7) Presented, *July 12*, 995, 1030.
- State-aided Schools, Number of Children attending.
  - *Q.* Mr. Massie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 10*, 707, 708.
- Teachers
  - Salaries, Local Authorities' Arrangements for Paying.
    - *Q.* Captain Faber; Mr. Birrell, *July 5*, 200.
  - Superannuation Fund, Amount to Credit of, etc.
    - *Q.* Mr. Armitage; *A.* Mr. Birrell, July, *10*, 709.
- Training Colleges
  - Financial Return Presented, *July 4*, 8.
- Vaccination, *see that title.*
- Welsh Intermediate Schools, Treasury Grant to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Gibbs; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 4*, 36.

Education (England and Wales) Bill
- *c. Com., July 4*, 64; *July 9*, 535; *July 10*, 741; *July 11*, 900; *July 16*, 1361.
- Clause 4—Public Inquiry, Payment of Cost of.
  - *Q.* Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 10*, 708, 709.
- Date of Introduction in the House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion, etc.
  - *Os.* Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 5*, 175-177; Marquess of Ripon, 179-181; Lord Newton, 184; Lord Burghclere, 185; Earl of Crewe, 195, 196.
- Debates in Committee (Commons), July *4*, 64; *July 9*, 535; *July 10*, 741; *July 11*, 900; *July 16*, 1361.
  - Aid Grant of £1,000,000, Allocation of—Salaries of Commissioners, Payment out of, 742.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont*
- Debates in Committee—*cont.*
  - Charitable Trusts and Endowments, School-houses held under
    - Charity Commissioners, Consent of, to Transfer to be obtained, proposed, 66-69, 73.
    - Commission to deal with all Questions
      - Constitution of, 67, 68, 71, 72.
      - Continuing Powers of in Force after 31st December, 1908, Rights as to, to be Vested in Parliament proposed, 749-751.
      - Decisions of, Possibility of Reviewing, 630-636, 749.
      - Discretion of Commissioners, 84-96, 540.
      - Duties of, Application of Doctrine of *cy pres*, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 87, 88, 103, 140, 141, 143.
      - Estimate of Amount of Work, to be required from, 744-747.
      - Expenses of Proceedings, Provision for, 78, 89.
      - Names of Commissioners, Insertion of, in Clause, 741.
      - Places of Meeting, Question as to, 747, 748.
      - Remuneration of Commissioners, Provision for, 743.
      - Sub Commission, Question as to appointing, 742, 746, 748.
    - Definition of word "Trust," for Purposes of the Act, Necessity for, 74-96, 751, 752.
    - Educational Trusts the only ones to be included in the Act, 74-96, 751-756.
    - "Loose" and "Mixed" Trusts, Position of, 75-78, 81-83, 86, 90, 91, 126, 127, 128.
  - Church of England, Blow Aimed at, 545.
  - Clause VIII.
    - Amending Clause in line 28 to read "or other matters as the Commission think just," 559-563.
    - Sub-paragraph (2), Omission of, proposed, 579-582.
    - Sub-paragraph III.
      - "Limited Nature of the," Insertion of Words, proposed, 601-604.
      - Omission of, proposed, 587-598.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales Bill)—*cont.*
- Debates in Committee—*cont.*
  - Clause VIII. —*cont.*
    - Sub-section (*a*)
      - Omission of Word "best' in line 25, and Insertion of Word "only," proposed, 554–557.
      - Omission of word "is" in line 24, and Insertion of Word "advisable" in line 25, proposed, 553–554.
      - Omission of Words "sufficient guarantee is given," proposed, 535–538.
    - Sub-section (1)
      - "Limited," Omission of Word, proposed, 585–587.
    - Sub-section 2.
      - Paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) Omission of, proposed, 133–145.
    - Sub-Section (4), Omission of, proposed, 630–636.
    - "Where," Omission of Word in page 5, line 5, proposed, 69–73.
  - Clause XXV., Omission of, 900.
  - Clauses XI., XII. and XIII. agreed to, without Discussion, 837–839.
  - Clauses XXX.–XXXIII. agreed to, without Discussion, 983.
  - Clause XXXV.
    - Effect of, on Previous Sections in Regard to Transfers, 1368, 1369.
    - Sub-section (*a*), Omission of, proposed, 1361, 1363, 1364.
  - Delegation of Powers to Local Authorities, Proposals as to, 900–940.
    - *Ad hoc* Authority, Reverting to, proposed, 929, 931, 932, 933, 935.
    - By-laws, Power of Enacting and Enforcing, 915, 933, 938.
    - Curriculum, Powers of Representation to Central Authority as to, proposed, 918, 919, 922, 930, 933, 934, 938.
    - Embodying Proposals in a Separate Bill, proposed, 936, 937, 939.
    - Financial Responsibility of Localities, Question as to, 906, 908, 909, 927, 928, 930.
    - Limiting Power of Application for, to Authorities in Districts with a Population of 30,000 and over, 940–942.
    - Local Inquiry into Advisability of, proposed, 910.
    - Rates, Method of relieving Burden of, 911, 912, 914, 930, 931, 937.

Education (England and Wales Bill)—*cont.*
- Debates in Committee—*cont.*
  - Elementary Schools
    - Instruction in Day Schools up to age of Sixteen, proposed, 1411–1421.
    - Scholarships or Bursaries for Aid of Scholars beyond Age or Standard of Compulsory Attendance, proposed, 1426–1434.
  - Evening Continuation or Technical Schools, Compulsory Attendance at, up to Age of Seventeen Years, proposed, 1402–1411.
  - Health and Physical Condition of Children, Compulsory Medical Inspection, etc., Provisions for, 1376–1399.
    - Cost of, 1378, 1379, 1381, 1383.
    - Limiting Expenditure on, to a Penny Rate, proposed, 1399–1401.
    - Medical Treatment, Question as to, 1390, 1398, 1399.
  - Teachers, Pupil, granting Powers to Local Authorities for Training of, up to date of entering a Training College, proposed, 1421–1425.
  - Vacation Schools or Means of Holiday Recreation, Powers of Local Authorities to provide, 1361–1376.
    - Book-work, Omission of, proposed, 1369, 1370.
    - Consent of Owners or Trustees to be obtained, proposed, 1375, 1376.
    - Cost of, 1368.
    - Extension of Powers to other Times than Holiday Time, proposed, 1374, 1375.
    - Parental Responsibility, Objections to Interference with, 1363.
    - "Play Centres," Provision of, proposed, 1370–1372.
    - Provision of, Elsewhere than in School-houses, proposed, 1372, 1373.
    - Teachers, Provision of, Proposals as to, 1361, 1362, 1364, 1367.
  - Loans, Extension of Period for Repayment of, 946.

[*cont.*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
- Debates in Committee—*cont.*
  - Loans, Extension of Period, etc.—*cont.*
    - Eighty Years, proposed, 946–949.
    - Position of Loans raised under Old System since Passing of Act of 1902, 949–951.
    - Sixty Years, Objections to Period, 952–956.
    - Thirty-Five Years, Reduction of, Period to, proposed, 952–956.
  - New Clause, Opportunity for Discussion of, 72, 73.
  - Part II., Omission of, 849.
  - Purchase and Appropriation of Land, Powers of Local Authorities as to, 942–946.
  - Rate, Removal of Twopenny Limit for Higher Education, 963–974.
    - Proposed Increases to be Referred to Ratepayers, proposed, 963–974.
  - Schemes made under
    - Alteration of by Order of Board of Education on Application of Owners, or Local Authorities, Granting Powers for, proposed, 627–630.
    - Subjecting to like Conditions as to Publication and Approval by His Majesty in Council as Schemes made under Endowed Schools Acts, proposed, 613–618.
    - Tabling in both Houses as soon as possible and leaving there for Six Weeks, proposed, 621–624.
  - Teachers
    - Appointment of Teachers in Voluntary Schools during Transition Period, to be only "in accordance with Terms of Trust," proposed, 785–792, 824, 825.
    - Dismissal of Teachers in hitherto Non-provided Schools, Powers of Local Authorities as to, 780–782.
    - Payment of Salaries of, by Local Authorities, during Transition Period, 811–820.
  - Voluntary Schools Transferred to Local Authorities.
    - Aid Grants Received by, to be Taken into Consideration when Fixing Rents, 134, 136, 139, 141.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*con t*
- Debates in Committee—*cont.*
  - Voluntary Schools, etc.—*cont.*
    - Aid Grants Received by—*cont.*
      - Confining Application o Clause to Capital Expenditure and Exemption of Repairs,proposed 563–565.
      - Contributions of Supporters and Saving Effected to Public Funds as regards Expenses of Administration, etc., Taking into Consideration, proposed, 571–574.
      - "Dates at which such Grants were received," Insertion of Words proposed, 565–568.
    - Buildings
      - Alterations and Repairs by Local Authorities, During Temporary Occupancy, Limiting, proposed, 767–770.
      - Disputes Between Owners and Local Authorities, Procedure as to Referring to Commission, 558.
      - Payment for Temparary Use of, by Local Authorities, proposed, 756–760.
      - Rent
        - Amount of, to be in no Case less than amount Produced by a Charge of 5s. per head, proposed, 610–613.
        - Facilities given for special Religious Instruction and Performance of Original Trusts, to be taken into consideration, 587–598.
      - Terms of Acquisition of by Local Authorities, 757, 758, 759.
    - Chancery Division of High Court of Justice, Substitution of for Commission, proposed, 121–125.
    - Closing of, Restrictions on
      - Privately owned Schools, Exemption of, proposed, 825–834.
    - Commission, *see under subheading* Charitable Trusts and Endowments.
    - Compulsory Attendance at Religious Instruction During Transition Period, Question as to, 796–808.

[*cont*

Education (England and Wales Bill)—*cont.*
Debates in Committee—*cont.*
Voluntary Schools, etc.—*cont.*
Compulsory Provision of Denominational Facilities if Required by Owners, proposed, 607–610.
Continuing Denominational Instruction During Transition Period, proposed, 770–780, 796–808.
Costs of Inquiries by Local Authorities, Method of Defraying, 561.
Date of Bringing under Control of Local Authorities, Extension of Period for Negotiation, proposed, 765–767.
Guarantee for Effective Continuance of School for Five Years, 134, 135, 136, 137, 141, 142, 143, 536–542, 545–550.
Substitution of One Year for Five Years, proposed, 545–550.
Limiting Use of School Houses by Local Authorities to Purposes of Public Elementary Schools, proposed, 125–130.
Limiting Use of School-houses, in so far as was necessary, for carrying on an Elementary School, "in accordance with the Terms of the Trust," proposed, 763–765.
Owners of Schoolhouses, Granting Right to, of Applying to Commission, proposed, 101–114.
Requiring Local Authority to Comply with such Conditions as to Payment or otherwise not being Inconsistent with the Act, proposed, 557–560.
Teachers giving Denominational Instruction during Transition Period, Provisions as to, 775–780.
Women, Administration of Educational work by, Tribute to, 923, 925, 927, 929.
Grant of £1,000,000, Date of Issuing Regulations as to Distribution of.
Q. Mr. W. Hope; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 5*, 238.
Q. Mr. C. Warner; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 493.
Part III., proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 525, 526.
Repeal Schedule, Note Explanatory of, Presented, *July 5*, 199.

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
Religious Instruction
Article 15 of Code, Operation of.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 5*, 206.
Certified Efficient School Managers, Powers of to make Agreements as to Religious Instruction.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 6*, 357.
Syllabuses Issued by Diocesan and other Associations for use in Church of England Schools—Statement Presented, *July 16*, 1275, 1299.
"Schools Hours," Definition of.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 11*, 881.
Schools Connected with Institutions, Provisions as to.
Q. Mr. F. E. Smith; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 4*, 19.
Q. Mr. Harmood Banner; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 5*, 205.
State-aided Schools
Control of.
Q. Mr. J. F. Mason; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 11*, 881.
Grants, Receipt and Administration of.
Q. Mr. J. F. Mason; Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 525.
Teachers
Agreements, Enforcement of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lane-Fox; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 526, 527.
Compensation for Discharge, Provision as to.
Q. Sir H. Craik; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 13*, 1188.
Religious Instruction, Denomination Power to make Agreement as to.
Qs. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 6*, 357.
Salaries—Amendment of Clause 10, Subsection (2), proposed.
Qs. Mr. Lane-Fox; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 1344, 1345.
Superannuation Claims under Amended Form of Clause 4.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 524.
Tenure of Office, Conditions of
Q. Mr. J. F. Mason; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 525.
Voluntary Schools.
Appeal against Transfer, Procedure in.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 1345, 1346.
Position of, on Transfer.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 6*, 356.

[*cont*

Education (England and Wales) Bill—*cont.*
  Voluntary Schools—*cont.*
    Religious Denominational Instruction, Facilities for.
      Managers, Constitution of.
        Q. Mr. S. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 10*, 708.
      Procedure in Demanding.
        Q. Mr. S. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 526.
      Teacher, Conditions of Appointing.
        Q. Mr. S. Roberts; Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 526.
  Welsh Intermediate Act, 1889—Report on Administration under, *July 16*, 1275, 1299.

Education, Ireland
  See also names of places.
  Consultative Committee, Constitution of.
    Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; Mr. Dillon; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 49, 50.
  General Return (1904–5), Date of Presenting.
    Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 4*, 20.
  Intermediate Board
    Parliamentary Control over, etc.
      Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 10*, 738.
    Rules, etc.
      Minutes and Correspondence, Decision as to Tabling.
        Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 203.
      Proposals as to.
        Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 208, 209.
  National School Teachers' Salaries, proposals as to.
    Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 14.
  School Building Grants, Decision as to.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 50.
    Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 6*, 359.
  State-aided Schools, Number of Children Attending.
    Q. Dr. Massie; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 711, 712.

Education, Scotland
  Vice-President of the Council—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair
  See also names of places.
  General Return (1904–5), Date of Presenting.
    Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; Mr. Gladstone, *July 4*, 20.
  State-aided Schools, Number of Children Attending,
    Q. Dr. Massie; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 10*, 709, 710.

Education (Scotland) Act (1872) Amendment Bill
  c. 1R.* *July 4*, 60.

Edinburgh
  Inspectors of Taxes Office—Pension Claim of Clerk.
    Q. Mr. Younger; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 6*, 357, 358.

Edinburgh Corporation Bill
  l. Report from Select Committee,* *July 13*, 1173.

Egypt
  British Garrison, proposals as to.
    Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 9*, 510.
  British Officers, Attack on
    Circumstances of.
      Os. Mr. Dillon, *July 5*, 312–314.
    Execution and Flogging of Natives allegations as to Method of Carrying out, etc.
      Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 5*, 281, 282; Sir E. Grey 286–289, 315, 316, 317; Earl Percy, 289, 290, Mr. Dillon, 310, 311, 315.
      Correspondence relating to, awaiting prior to Debate, proposed.
        Os. Sir E. Grey, *July 5*, 286–289, 314.
      Statement (Sir E Grey), *July 5*, 286–289.
    Papers, Date of Tabling
      Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 1305.
    Punitive Measures adopted against Village of Denshawi.
      Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July* 16, 1305.
      Trial, Procedure in, Sentences inflicted, etc.
        Qs. Mr. MacVeagh, Mr. Belloc, Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 12*, 1054–1057.
        Date of receiving Despatch, etc.
          Qs. Mr. Dillon, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Paul; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 5*, 225–228.
  Cairo, Cavalry Barrack Accommodation at.
    Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 5*, 210.
  Condition of, Revival of Fanatical Feeling against Europeans, etc.
    Os. Sir E. Grey, *July 5*, 286, 288, 289, 317; Mr. Dillon, 310; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 330.
[*cont.*

Egypt—*cont*

Education—Secondary Schools, Religious Teaching in.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 1333.

El Azhar University Police Force, Reason for increasing.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 1306.

Law of Trespass, Decision as to Amendment of.
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 5*, 228.

Pigeon-shooting, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9*, 487.

Sanitary State of Towns—Tabling Correspondence, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 16*, 1309.

Sersena, Inquiry into Death of Native near—Charges against British Soldiers, etc.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 1304.

Sinai Peninsula, Turkish Occupation of

British Naval Vessels in the Levant.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 12*, 1045.

Turco-Egyptian Frontier, Progress made with Delimitation of.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 1332.

Correspondence Presented, *July 13*, 1174, 1184.

Unrest in—Prosecutions, etc., of Europeans during Last Five Years.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 12*, 1054.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 5*, 160.
3R.* *July 6*, 334.
c. 1R.* *July 6*, 352.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
*c. Rep.** *July 5*, 198.
*Con.** and 3R.* *July 6*, 351.
l. 1R.* *July 6*, 334.
2R.* *July 16*, 1243.

Elgin and Kincardine, Earl of—*Secretary of State for the Colonies*

Transvaal Chinese Labourers

Crimes committed by, Proposals as to dealing with, and protecting White Inhabitants, *July 6*, 344.

Licences, Further Issue of, Reasons for—Policy of the Government, etc., *July 6*, 344–346.

Ellenborough, Lord

Defence of the Empire—Dissemination of News in War Time, Government Control over, etc.—Introduction of Bill, proposed, *July 13*, 1174–1179.

Merchant Shipping — Conditions of Service, *July 5*, 172.

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill—Date of sending to the Lords, allowing Time for Adequate Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 172.

Ellis, Rt. Hon. J. E.—*Under-Secretary for India* [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]

Army—Execution of Private of 1st Lincolns, Circumstances of, *July 16*, 1325.

Assam—Udoya Patni, Alleged Hanging of, after sending in Appeal, *July 10*, 718.

Bengal, Eastern—"Bande Mataram" Regulations as to Prohibition of Annoyance caused by shouting, *July 16*, 1323, 1324.

Leopards and Tigers, Discontinuance of Rewards for killing, proposed, *July 10*, 717.

Public Works Department Appointments—Nationality of Candidates, *July 16*, 1326.

Railways

Raipur-Vizianagram Scheme—Improvement of Vizagapatam Harbour, *July 11*, 874.

Rolling Stock, Alleged Inadequacy of *July 10*, 717.

Ellis Estate

Cattle Mutilation—Measures taken for Discovery of Miscreants, etc.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 737.

Elphin

United Irish League Meeting, Speeches at, Attendance of Police, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Hayden; *As.* Mr. Bryce, Mr. Speaker, *July 11*, 886–888.

Emigration and Immigration

Annual Report, Date of issuing.
Q. Mr. Levy; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 11*, 856.

Emigration Office, Proposals as to reorganising, etc.
Q. Sir J. Dickson-Poynder; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1322.

Ireland—Statistics for 1906.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1350, 1351.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]

Hammersmith City, and North East London Railway Bill—Suspension of Proceedings on, until Next Session, *July 4*, 4.

Ennis

Assizes, Cases heard at, Condition of County, etc.
Qs. Mr. Halpin, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *July 10*, 728, 729.

Epsom

North Tadworth Farm, Eviction of Mr. W. Hodson from.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 12*, 1065, 1066.

Epsom and Ewell Gas Bill

c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 9*, 478.

Essex, Mr. R. W. [Gloucestershire, Cirencester]

Alderney Cattle Importation Regulations—Tabling Correspondence, proposed, *July 5*, 241.

Crimes, etc.—Death Sentences passed (1851–1900), *July 10*, 724; *July 16*, 1312.

Leckhampton Right of Way Dispute—Sentence on Mr. Barrett, *July 12*, 1059.

Poor Law—Amendment of Law as to Filial Liability, proposed, *July 5*, 236.

Estate Duties

Assessment and Collection, Procedure in.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 12*, 1058.

Committee, Witnesses examined by, etc.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 11*, 863.

Recovery of Omissions or Under-Estimates, Power as to.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 10*, 726.

Estimates

See also titles Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, *and* Navy Estimates.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorgan, Mid.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 95, 106, 107.

Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1468, 1473.

Evans-Gordon, Major Sir W. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]

Lancers, 9th (Queen's Royal) South African Service of, *July 5*, 209, 210.

Persia—German Application for Railway Concession to Kermanshah, *July 9*, 511.

Street Traffic Report, Delay in Circulation, *July 5*, 232.

Turco-Persian Boundary Commission—Date and Place of Meeting in regard to Pasova, *July 9*, 512.

Exmouth

Hunt, Mrs. Case of.
Q. Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 9*, 516, 517.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill

Acts proposed to be included in.
Q. Mr. O'Mara; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 4*, 58.

Exports and Imports

Food Inspection, Amendment of Law as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 9*, 492.

Faber, Capt. W. V. [Hants, Andover]

Education—Teachers' Salaries, Arrangements for paying by Local Authorities, *July 5*, 200.

Navy—"Britannia" Cadets—Instruction in handling Open Sailing Boats, proposed, *July 4*, 8.

Faber, Mr. G. D. [York]

Cattle, Importation Restrictions, Removal of, proposed, *July 13*, 1226.

Railway Rates on Agricultural Produce, *July 13*, 1227.

Faber, Mr. G. H. [Boston]

Motors, Prevention of Accidents from, *July 9*, 521.

Factories and Workshops

Food—Inspection Regulations, Power to enforce Cleanliness of Workers, etc., under the Act.
Qs. Mr. A. Henderson; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 1336.

Home Industries, Progress made with Application of Act to.
Q. Mr. J. W. Taylor; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 5*, 231.

Inspectors, Distances travelled by.
Q. Mr. Chiozza-Money; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 12*, 1058.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]

Dring Telegraph Extension, Progress made with, *July 4*, 57.

Longford Post Office, Hours of Business, Decision as to, *July 4*, 57.

Royal Canal, Condition of, *July 4*, 49.

Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill

Motion to commit to Standing Committee on Trade [Mr. T. Shaw], *July 4*, 61.
Os. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, *July 4*, 61, 64; Mr. T. Shaw, 61, 62; Sir B. Gurdon, 62; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 62; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 63; Mr. Dalziel, 64.

Report from Standing Committee on Trade, *July 11*, 899.

Transfer of Members of Grand Committee on Law, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Younger; *A.* Sir B. Gurdon, *July 9*, 528, 529.

Faulkner Estate
Purchase Negotiations for.
Q. Mr. Hammond; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1040.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
Gipsies, Application of Aliens Act to prevent Arrival of, *July 12*, 1060.
Traction Engine Traffic in European Capitals, *July 11*, 878.
Tramways on Steep Hills, Prohibition of, proposed, *July 11*, 876.

Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Bill
c. Report from Standing Committee on Law, *July 10*, 740.
Con., *July 13*, 1236.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
Allotments Act—Extension to Ireland, proposed, *July 16*, 1316.
Belfast, Troops in, Meat supplied to, *July 9*, 487.
Civil Service, Boy Clerks, Appointments, Dismissals, etc., of, *July 16*, 1309.
Crown Lands (Recovery of Crown Rents) —Resolution, *July 16*, 1446.
Education, Intermediate Board Rules, etc. —Proposals as to, *July 5*, 208.
Food, Imported—Amendment of Law as to Inspection, proposed, *July 9*, 492.
Gambling—Protection of Bank Stock proposed, *July 9*, 499.
Government Department, Irish, Second Division Clerks appointed to (1901–1906), *July 9*, 491.
Income Tax Assessment of American Beef Companies, *July 9*, 496.
Post Office Savings Bank Unclaimed Balances, Preparation of Index to—Procedure in transferring to Dormant Ledgers, etc., *July 16*, 1310, 1311.
Railways
Clearing House Returns, Irish, Information contained in, etc., *July 16*, 1315.
Great Southern and Western, Rates on Agricultural Exhibits, *July 9*, 497.
Inquiry, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 207; *July 16*, 1316.
Rates, etc., Complaints as to—Alteration of Present System proposed, *July 9*, 492.
War Office Meat Contracts—Increasing Number of Army Stations for Slaughtering Cattle, proposed, *July 16*, 1308.

Finchley
Telephone Exchange Service for, proposed.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 11*, 856, 857.

Findhorn
Postal Facilities, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. A. Williamson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 11*, 878, 879.

First Commissioner of Works
Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt.

First Lord of the Admiralty
Lord Tweedmouth.

First Lord of the Treasury
Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Fisheries
Ireland
Boats built for and purchased by Congested Districts Board—Return Presented, *July 11*, 855.
Drift Nets, Decision as to Restrictions on Use of.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 209.
Trawling, *see that title.*

Fitzmaurice, Lord—*Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs*
Russia, Visit of British Fleet during Manœuvres, Abandonment of Proposal, *July 16*, 1274.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Agriculture Department, Grant to, *July 4*, 42.
Congested Districts Board—Land Purchase, Price paid, etc., *July 4*, 46.
Cork—Agriculture Department Schemes put into Operation, *July 4*, 46.
Dromahane — Reinstatement of Mrs. O'Regan, *July 4*, 40.
Fuge Estate—Reinstatement Applications received, etc., *July 4*, 41.
Leader Estate—Reinstatement Claim of D. Fitzpatrick and Mrs. Cronin, *July 4*, 45.
Lunacy Grant, proposed Change in System of Paying, *July 4*, 54.
Tibet, Power possessing Right to refuse Entry to, July *5*, 224.
Trade Statistics, Irish, Facilities for compiling, *July 4*, 58.
Winter Dairying, Proposals as to, *July 4*, 47.

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill
c. 2R.* *July 4*, 1.
Rep. * *July 12*, 1028.

Folkestone and District Electricity Supply Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 5*, 198.
*Con.** *July 11*, 853.
3R* *July 16*, 1296.

Food Factories
- *See under* Factories.

Foreign Office
- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
- *Under-Secretary*—Lord Fitzmaurice.
- Policy of.
  - *Os.* Earl Percy, *July 5*, 290, 291; Sir E. Grey, 317, 318.
- Vote for, *July 5*, 253.
  - Discussion of, Inadequate Time granted for.
    - *Os.* Sir C. Dilke, *July 5*, 279; Mr. Rees, 359.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Rees; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 12*, 1074.

France
- British Official Relations with, Cordiality of.
  - *Os.* Sir E. Grey, *July 5*, 317, 318.

Friendly Societies
- Deficiencies—Vote for, *July 13*, 1237.

Fruit Industry
- Reports on Conditions of Crops in Holland, France, and Germany, during Season, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. Beck, *July 13*, 1222, 1223; Sir E. Strachey, 1229, 1232; Mr. Rowlands, 1232.

Fuge Estate
- Reinstatement Applications received, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 41.

Galway
- Sessional Divisions, Alteration of, proposed—Case of P. Duggan, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *July 11*, 882.

Gambling
- Bank Stock, Protection of, against Bull and Bear Operations.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 9*, 499.

Gardner, Mr. E. [Berks, Wokingham]
- Channel Islands, Abattoir for Reception of Live Cattle from Argentina, proposed Erection of, *July 13*, 1224.
- Railway Rates on Agricultural Produce, *July 13*, 1224.

Gateshead
- Maughan, H. (or W.) Case of—Sentence for Begging.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 1338, 1339.

Geneva Convention
- Columbia, Accession of, *July 9*, 470, 481.

Germany
- State Railways, Information as to.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 9*, 517, 518.

Gibbs, Mr. G. A. [Bristol, W.]
- Welsh Intermediate Schools, Treasury Grant to, *July 4*, 36.

Gibraltar
- Garrison in Reduction of, Proposals as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1105.

Gill, Mr. A. H. [Bolton]
- Indian Textile Mills, Conditions and Labour in, *July 4*, 11.

Ginnell, Mr. L. [Westmeath, N.]
- Agriculture Department, Grants to and Work of, *July 4*, 41.
- Congested Districts Inquiry, Scope of, *July 12*, 1067.
- Inny, Upper, Drainage Board, Constitution and Work of, *July 12*, 1043.
- Kilmaine, Lord, Estate of—Date of hearing Land Purchase Case, *July 12*, 1041.
- Labourers (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill—Extension to Untenanted Land, proposed, *July 4*, 40.
- Land Commission, Procedure in Fixing Rents, *July 11*, 885, 886.
- Land Purchase
  - Compulsory Declaration as Purchaser, Number of Cases of, *July 11*, 883.
  - Correspondence with Estates Commissioners, Access to, by Landlords and Tenants, *July 16*, 1349.
  - Estates Commissioners, Instructions to, Authorship of, *July 12*, 1067, 1068.
  - Price, Equity of—Reason for not Referring Cases of Disagreement to Judicial Decision, *July 11*, 884.
  - Tenants' Improvements, Protection of, *July 11*, 885.
  - Untenanted Land Return, Scope of, etc., *July 4*, 39, 40; *July 11*, 883.
  - Zones, price within—Effect of King-Harman *v* Hayes, Case of, *July 4*, 47.
- Local Government Board Inspectors, Return as to, proposed, *July 11*, 884.
- Westmeath Untenanted Land, Inquiry into, proposed, *July 12*, 1035.

Gipsies
- Aliens Act, Application of, to prevent Arrival.
  - *Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 12*, 1060.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]
  Chesshire, Miss A. L., Case of—Inquiry proposed, *July 12*, 1061.
  Chester-le-Street—Case of R. Dixon, *July 10*, 722.
  Children, Insurance of—Legislation to limit Amount payable, proposed, *July 16*, 1335.
  Coal Mines, Inspection of—Decision as to South Wales Inspectorate, *July 4*, 31, 32.
  Crimes and Criminal Offences
    Death Sentences passed (1851–1900), *July 10*, 724; *July 16*, 1314.
  Cunynghame, Mr. H. H. S., Duties, etc., of, *July 10*, 722.
  Ecclesiastical Discipline Commission Report "Houses of Laymen," Legal *Status* of, *July 5*, 232.
  Education—General Return (1904–5), date of Presenting, *July 4*, 20.
  Exmouth—Case of Mrs. Hunt, *July 9*, 517.
  Factories
    Act, Progress made with Applying to Home Industries, *July 5*, 231.
    Food—Regulations as to Inspection, etc., *July 16*, 1336.
    Inspectors, Distances Travelled by *July 12*, 1058.
  Gateshead—Case of W. Maughan, *July 16*, 1338, 1339.
  Gipsies, Application of Aliens Act to prevent Arrival of, *July 12*, 1060.
  Guerin, E., Case of, *July9*, 515.
  Juvenile, Offenders, Separate Treatment, etc. for—Legislative proposals, *July 10*, 710.
  Leckhampton Right of Way Disturbances —Sentence inflicted, etc., *July 11*, 875, *July 12*, 1059.
  London Streets—Danger arising from Cyclists Distributing Newspapers, *July 13*, 1187.
  Lost Property, Procedure in Paying Rewards for finding, *July 4*, 32.
  Manchester—Reason for Police Raid on Premises of Messrs. Jaffe & Co., *July 13*, 1186.
  Marlborough Street Police Court—Fine imposed on Cabdriver Simmons, *July 9*, 517.
  Monastic and Conventual Institutions—Conditions of Permission to use Private Burying Grounds, *July 5*, 230, 231.
  Motors Accident in Metropolitan Area, *July 10*, 721; *July 16*, 1313.
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 156; *July 16*, 1460, 1466, 1477–1479.
  Omnibus and Tram Ticket Prizes, Legality of, *July 9*, 514.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*
  Patent Medicines, restrictions on Sale of, proposed, *July 12*, 1060.
  Piccadilly Traffic Regulations—Case of J. Scott, *July 13*, 1186.
  Police, Metropolitan
    Hitchcock, Mrs. Case of, *July 9*, 514.
    Intoxication, Charge of, against Constables—Regulation as to claiming Medical Opinion, *July 16*, 1334.
    Race Meetings, Employment at, *July* 10, 720, 721.
    Sunday Duty and Annual Holiday, *July 5*, 230.
    Weekly Day of Rest, proposed, *July 16*, 1337.
  Southwark County Court—Judge's decision in Case under Workmen's Compensation Act, *July 9*, 513.
  Street Traffic Report, Delay in circulating *July 5*, 232.
  Tin and Black Plate industry—Revision of Inspector System, proposed, *July 10*, 723.
  Tramways on Steep Hills, Prohibition of, proposed, *July 11*, 876, 877.
  Truck Act Committee
    Case of Dean *v.* Wilson, Bringing to Notice of, proposed, *July 16*, 1339.
    Progress made by, etc., *July 10*, 724.
  Vaccination Exemption Certificates
    Palmer, Mr. W. C., Case of, *July 10*, 711.
    Priestley, Mr. S., and Mr. W. Griffiths, Cases of, *July 9*, 515, 516.
  Vivisection Royal Commission, proposals as to, *July 16*, 1335.
  Women, Enfranchisement of—Disturbance in Cavendish Square, Sentence on Suffragettes, etc., *July 5*, 233, 332.

Glamorgan and South Wales Water Bill
  c. *Rep.** *July 5*, 198.
    *Con.** *July 11*, 853.
    3R.* *July 16*, 1296.

Glanders
  Method of Dealing with Outbreaks of—Policy of Board of Agriculture.
    Os. Mr. L. Hardy, *July 13*, 1210, 1211; Sir E. Strachey, 1227, 1228.

Glasgow
  Barlinnie Prison
    Accommodation in—Allegations as to Overcrowding, etc.
      Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 16*, 1347, 1348.

[*cont.*

Glasgow—*cont.*
  Barlinnie Prison—*cont.*
    Discharge System, Annoyance caused by, alleged.
      Q. Mr. Wood, *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 12*, 1038.

  Postmen, Revision of Allowances to.
    Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 5*, 237.

Glasgow University
  Pharmacy, Institution of Degree in Science—Court Ordinance No. XVI. Presented, *July 9*, 471, 480.

Glasgow and South Western Railway Order Confirmation Bill
  l. 2R.* *Com.* July 10*, 654.
    3R*. *July 12*, 994.
  c. 1R.* *July 13*, 1182.
    2R.* *July 16*, 1297.

Glendinning, Mr. R. [Antrim, N.]
  Ballymoney Post Office Messenger, Duties of, *July 11*, 860.

Glenties
  Poor Law Clerk, Decision as to Increase of Salary of.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1348.

Gooch, Mr. G. P. [Bath]
  Macedonia, Financial Condition, etc., *July 9*, 510.

Goschen, Viscount
  Autumn Session, Course of Business during, *July 5*, 188, 189.

  Bills, Introduction into House of Lords.
    Period for, Inadequate time for Discussion Under present System, etc., *July 5*, 188.

    Revision, Powers of, Necessity for Exercising, *July 5*, 188.

  London County Council, Financial Methods of—*Status* of Credit, etc., *July 9*, 452, 453.

  London County Council (Money) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 452–454.

Government Departments, Ireland
  Officials' Names, Ages, etc.—Return Ordered, *July 12*, 1030.

  Second Division Clerks Appointed (1901–1906).
    Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 9*, 491.

Granard, Earl of
  London County Council [General Powers] Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 1268.

  Merchant Shipping
    British Seamen, Supply and Training of.
      Departmental Committee of Inquiry, Appointment of, *July 5*, 170.
      State-Aided Training Ships, etc., Establishment of, *July 5*, 168.
    Foreign and Lascar Seamen on British Ships, *July 5*, 168.

  Motor Cars Commission—Date of Presenting Report, *July 10*, 701.

Grand Committees
  Procedure before, Information as to.
    Os. Mr. L. Hardy, *July 6*, 414.

Grantham, Mr. Justice
  Great Yarmouth Parliamentary Election Petition, Allegations as to Conduct of Proceedings by, *see* Great Yarmouth.

Graves, Lord
  Representative Peer for Ireland, Claim to Vote for, *July 5*, 157.

Great Central and Lancashire, Derbyshire, and East Coast Railway Bill
  c. 3R.* *July 6*, 350.
  l. Commons Amendts., *Con.* July 12*. 994.

Great Northern Railway Bill
  l. 2R.* *July 10*, 654.

Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill
  c. 2R.* *July 9*, 649.

Great Yarmouth Parliamentary Election Petition
  Proceedings at Trial, Allegations against Mr. Justice Grantham.
    Os. Mr. MacNeill, *July 6*, 369–376, 413, 414; Sir G. Kekewich, 376–378; Mr. Buckmaster, 378–387; Mr. A. Dewar, 387–391; Sir J. Walton, 391–402; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 402–408; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 408–412; Mr. Everett 412; Sir J. Jardine, 412; Mr. Blake, 413.

    Bodmin Case, Comparison with.
      Os. Mr. MacNeill, *July 6*, 375; Mr. Buckmaster, 385; Sir J. Walton, 400, 401; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 404.

Great Yarmouth Parliamentary Election Petition—*cont.*
Proceedings at Trial—*cont.*
Committee to Consider and Report on—*Motion* (Mr. MacNeill), *July 6*, 369, 378, 413.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, *July 6*, 371; Sir G. Kekewich, 376; Mr. A. Dewar, 387–388; Sir J. Walton, 391, 392; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 406–408; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 408, 410; Mr. Everett, 412; Sir J. Jardine, 412.
Corrupt Practices, Evidences of.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, *July 6*, 373–375; Sir G. Kekewich, 378; Mr. Buckmaster, 379–384; Mr. A. Dewar, 388–391; Sir J. Walton, 399; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 404.
Government Attitude.
Q. Mr. Arkwright; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 4*, 59.
Parliamentary Control over Justices.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, *July 6*, 369, 370; Mr. Buckmaster, 379; Mr. A. Dewar, 387; Sir J. Walton, 392.
Political Bias and Partisanship, Charges of.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, *July 6*, 372–376; Sir G. Kekewich, 377; Mr. Buckmaster, 384–387; Sir J. Walton, 395–399; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 404–406, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 409–411; Mr. Blake, 413.
Press Opinion of the Judgment.
Os. Mr. MacNeill, *July 6*, 371.
Removal of Mr. Justice Grantham from the Bench, Question as to.
Os. Sir J. Walton, *July 6*, 392–395, 401, 402; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 402; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 410–412.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill
c. 2R.* *July 11*, 853.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]
Abyssinia Railway Agreement, Progress of Negotiations as to, *July 5*, 225; *July 12*, 1054.
Africa, West—Portuguese Islands of S. Thomé and Principé, Allegations as to Slavery in, *July 5*, 229.
Borneo—Relations between Brunei and Sarawak, etc., *July 9*, 491.
China
International Control over, alleged Attempt of China to Acquire Immunity from, *July 5*, 325.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
China—*cont.*
Punitive Methods prevailing in British Concessions—Allegations as to Flogging and use of the "Cangue," *July 5*, 326.
Congo Free State—Belgian Administration of, Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives, etc., *July 5*, 318–324.
Berlin Act, International Commission for Congo Navigation, Power to set up, under, *July 5*, 323.
Consular Courts, Right of Great Britain to Establish, *July 5*, 323.
Origin of—Declarations of International Association of the Congo, *July 5*, 318.
Egypt
British Officers, Attack on
Execution and Flogging of Natives, Allegations as to Method of carrying out, etc., *July 5*, 286–289, 315, 316, 317.
Proceedings at Trial, Sentence Inflicted, etc., *July 5*, 226–228; *July 12*, 1054–1057.
Condition of Revival of Fanatical Feeling against Europeans, etc., *July 5*, 286, 288, 289, 317
Law of Trespass, Decision as to Amendment of, *July 5*, 228.
Sanitary State of Towns—Tabling Correspondence, proposed, *July 16*, 1309.
Unrest in, Prosecutions of Europeans during last Five Years, *July 12*, 1054.
Foreign Office, Policy of, *July 5*, 317, 318.
France, Cordiality of British Official Relations with, *July 5*, 317, 318.
Japan, British Alliance with, *July 5*, 317.
Macedonia, Budget Deficit, Proposal for Meeting out of Increased Turkish Customs Dues, *July 5*, 324, 325.
Morocco, Slavery in, proposals for Abolition of, *July 10*, 718, 719.
Pilchards—Italian Government Reply to Representations, *July 11*, 859
Russia
Anti-Semitic Disturbances in, Intervention by Great Britain, proposed, *July 5*, 327.
British Fleet, Projected Visit of, *July 5*, 229, 327–330.
Russo-Japanese War—Settlement of Claims for British Vessels seized by Russian Cruisers, *July 5*, 203.
Servia—Conditions of Resuming Diplomatic Relations by Great Britain, *July 10*, 719.
Turkey—Customs Duties, proposed Increase in, Conditions Imposed by Great Britain, *July 5*, 324, 325.

Griffith, Mr. E. J. [Anglesey]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 790.

Grimthorpe, Lord
- Compulsory Military Service, Proposals as to—Cost of the Scheme, etc., *July 10*, 690–692, 694.
- Defence of the Empire, Expansion outside Limit of Regular Forces, Necessity for, *July 10*, 693.
- Militia, Territorial Army, Converting into proposed, *July 10*, 694, 695.

Ground Game Bill
- *l. Com.*, *July 12*, 996.

Grove Park
- Workhouse Officials' Salaries, Decision as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Barker; *A.* Mr. Burns. *July 11*, 878.

Guerin, E.
- Case of—Decision as to Nationality, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 9*, 515.

Gulland, Mr. J. W. [Dumfries Burghs]
- Lunacy—Scotch Asylum Officials, Superannuation Rights of, *July 16*, 1347.

Gurdon, Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
- Africa, South—Self-Government Proposals, Opportunity for discussing, etc., *July 9*, 482.
- Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill
  - Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 4*, 62.
  - Transfer of Members of Grand Committee on Law, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 529.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
- Africa, South, Garrison in
  - Bloemfontein Transport Deficiencies, *July 9*, 502.
  - Reduction, and Change in Character of—New Scheme, *July 12*, 1105.
- Artillery
  - Batteries, Cost of Upkeep of, *July 9*, 504.
  - Horse Artillery, Peace and War Establishment, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1094.
  - Militia Garrison Artillery
    - Training Scheme for, *July 12*, 1093, 1094.
    - Utilising Services of, for Ammunition Columns, proposed, *July 12*, 1090, 1091.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Artillery—*cont.*
  - Number of Guns required for a Battery, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1125.
  - Peace and War, Establishment—New Scheme for, *July 12*, 1091–1095.
  - Reserve for, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1091, 1092.
  - Strength of—Number of Battalions capable of taking the Field in Fighting Strength, *July 12*, 1088–1089.
- Auxiliary Forces (*see also subheadings* Militia, Volunteers, *and* Yeomanry)
  - Cost of, Increase in, during Last Ten Years, *July 12*, 1110.
- Barracks
  - Norwich Scheme, Decision as to, *July 10*, 713.
  - Tidworth Barracks Lighting Arrangements, *July 10*, 713.
- Belfast, Troops in, Meat supplied to, *July 9*, 487.
- Canteens in Aldershot, Alleged Short Weight in Goods sold at, *July 12*, 1044.
- Cardwell System, *July 12*, 1168, 1169.
- Ceylon, Garrison in, Proposed Reduction of, *July 12*, 1105.
- Compulsory Military Service, Possibility of establishing, *July 12*, 1082.
- Courts Martial, Murder Trials Abroad, Regulations as to, *July 12*, 1037.
- Dartmoor—Artillery Practice on Public Holidays, *July 9*, 488.
- Defence of the Empire
  - Committee of Defence, Valuable Work of, *July 12*, 1078.
  - Navy as Sole Means of, Supplementing by Increased Land Defence, etc., *July 12*, 1080.
- Defence of India, Large Number of Troops required for—Difficulty of effecting Reduction, etc., *July 12*, 1082, 1083.
- Efficiency, Necessity for securing, *July 12*, 1076, 1077, 1079.
- Egypt
  - Cavalry Barrack Accommodation at Cairo, *July 5*, 210.
  - Pigeon-shooting, Regulations as to, *July 9*, 487.
- Emergency Rations, Reason for destroying, *July 4*, 13.
- Executions in Public, Prohibition of, proposed, *July 12*, 1037.
- Expansion, Necessity for, and Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1081, 1117, 1166.
- Expeditionary Force, Strength and Composition of, *July 12*, 1095–1099.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. H. B.—*cont.*
- Expenditure
  - Investigation into Items of, from Point of View of Efficiency, *July 12*, 1079.
  - Reduction of, Necessity for, and Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1076.
- Gibraltar, Garrison in, Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1105.
- Guards
  - Aldershot Brigade, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1102, 1103.
  - Average Cost per Man, *July 9*, 502; *July 12*, 1103, 1104, 1170.
  - Cost per Battalion per annum, *July 9*, 503.
  - Reduction in Strength of, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1101–1104, 1140.
  - Reservists, Statistics as to, *July 9*, 502.
- Health of the Army—Reform Measures *July 12*, 1107–1109.
- Hospital Accommodation in War, Proposed Reduction of, *July 12*, 1109.
- Kilkenny Officers' Quarters (and Mess, Allocation of Contracts for furnishing, *July 9*, 488.
- Lancers, 9th (Queen's Royal) South African Service of, *July 5*, 210.
- Malta, Garrison in, Reduction of, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1105.
- Militia
  - First Line of, Drafts for the Regular Army, proposed, *July 12*, 1111, 1112.
  - Foreign Service for, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1111, 1113.
  - Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1111–1113.
  - Utilisation of, in certain branches of Regular Army work, Proposals as to , *July 12*, 1083, 1084.
  - Winter Training Scheme, Battalions selected for, *July 9*, 504.
- Mobilisation in Time of War, Organisation for, *July 12*, 1084, 1085.
- Officers, Shortage in, *July 12*, 1036, 1168.
- Ordnance Factories, Vaccination Regulations, *July 12*, 1036.
- Pensions
  - Non-commissioned Officers and Soldiers retired during Last Seven Years, *July 10*, 715.
  - Short Service Regulations, Date of cancelling, *July 11*, 864.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. H. B.—*cont.*
- *Personnel*
  - Reduction in, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1085, 1096, 1099, 1100, 1104, 1106.
    - Eight Battalions, Reduction of, *July 12*, 1087, 1096, 1104, 1106.
    - Over-sea Requirements the determining Factor, *July 12*, 1080, 1081, 1082, 1083.
  - Wastage, Provision for, *July 12*, 1098.
- Promotions, Outside Influence, Enforcement of Order prohibiting, *July 10*, 712.
- Recruiting and Enlistment—Under-age Recruits, Regulations as to—Case of M. McGarvey, *July 10*, 715, 716.
- Reorganisation Proposals
  - Opportunity for Adequate Discussion of, prior to carrying into effect, *July 12*, 1166, 1167.
  - Statement, *July 12*, 1075–1119, 1165–1171.
- Rifle Clubs, Loan of Rifles, etc., to, proposed, *July 4*, 14.
- Route March of Buffs in April, Casualties during, *July 9*, 501.
- Shortage, Automatic, during Next Six Years, *July 10*, 714.
- Six Big Divisions of Infantry with Four Cavalry Brigades and Full Artillery, proposed, *July 12*, 1086.
- Soldiers, Employment for, on Expiration of Service—Proposals as to Teaching of Trades, etc., *July 12*, 1167.
- Swiss Army Vaccination Regulations, *July 4*, 13.
- Terms of Enlistment
  - New Proposals, *July 12*, 1106.
  - Three Years' Enlistment System, Failure of, *July 12*, 1100.
- Tunbridge Wells—Chaplain's Sermon on Education Bill, *July 10*, 714.
- Volunteers
  - Field Artillery Guns for, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1093.
  - Functions of—New Scheme for a Territorial Army, *July 12*, 1114–1115, 1166.
  - Inns of Court Rifle Volunteers—Regulation as to Admission of Indian Law Students, *July 4*, 13.
  - Organisation of by means of County Associations, proposed, *July 12*, 1115–1117.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. H. B.—*cont.*
  War Office Meat Contracts
    "Home-Killed" substituted for "Home-Bred," Saving Effected by, *July 12*, 1110.
    Increasing Number of Army Stations for Slaughtering Cattle, proposed, *July 16*, 1308.
  Yeomanry
    Divisional Troops, Utilisation as, on Mobilisation, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1097, 1098.
    Drill Book—Revision of Present Instructions, proposed, *July 16*, 1309.
    Lothians and Berwickshire Regiment, Appointment of Lord Binning to, *July 12*, 1036.

Halpin, Mr. J. [Clare, W.]
  Clare Police Force, Reduction of, proposed, *July 10*, 734.
  Ennis Assizes, Cases heard at, Condition of County, etc., *July 10*, 728.

Hammersmith, City and North East London Railway Bill
  Motion for Suspension of Proceedings on, until next session (Mr. Emmott), *July 4*, 2–6; *July 5*, 158–160.
    Os. Mr. Morton, Mr. Emmott, *July 4*, 4.

Hammond, Mr. J. [Carlow]
  Faulkner Estate Purchase Negotiations, *July 12*, 1040.

Handcross Hill
  Motor Omnibus Accident—proposals as to Inquiry, etc.
    Os. Mr. Rowlands, Mr. Burns, Sir E. Carson, Mr. Hay, *July 12*, 1171, 1172.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale]
  Mall to Charing Cross—Proposals as to Spring Gardens Entrance, etc., *July 4*, 38.

Hardie, Mr. J. K. [Merthyr Tydvil]
  Africa, South, Convict and Prison Labour System, *July 10*, 706.
  Agricultural Rates Act, Basis of Payments under, *July 9*, 496.
  Aliens Act (Amendment) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 250.
  Coal Assessment for Rating Purposes, Inquiry into Present System, proposed, *July 9*, 496.
  Government Business to have Precedence until End of Session, and Adjournment of the House to be made without Question put, *July 13*, 1199.
  Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1460.

Hardie, Mr. J. K.—*cont.*
  Natal Native Rising
    Casualties among White and Black Forces, *July 5*, 214.
    Native Prisoners, Treatment of, *July 11*, 872, 873.
  Naval Manœuvres—Abandonment of Baltic Cruise, *July 16*, 1333.
  Russia, Projected Visit of British Fleet to, *July 5*, 228, 298–300.
  Trade Disputes Bill, Government Attitude towards—Time for Discussion, etc., *July 13*, 1199.
  Women, Enfranchisement of—Disturbance in Cavendish Square, Sentence on Suffragettes, etc., *July 5*, 253, 330.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
  Agriculture, Board of, Representative in the House of Commons, Question as to, *July 13*, 1210.
  Bills—Measures proposed to be dealt with during remainder of session, *July 13*, 1197.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 9*, 547 568, 535, 587, 591; *July 11*, 919, 972–974.
  Glanders, Method of dealing with Outbreaks of—Policy of Board of Agriculture, *July 13*, 1210, 1211.
  Grand Committees, Procedure before, Information as to, *July 6*, 414.
  Rothamstead Agricultural Research Institution—Grant for, proposed, *July 13*, 1212.
  Sheep Scab
    Dipping of Sheep—Compulsory Order as to, *July 13*, 1211.
    Method of dealing with Outbreaks of—Policy of Board of Agriculture, *July 13*, 1210, 1211.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S. [Liverpool, Everton]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill—Schools Connected with Institutions, Position of, *July 5*, 205.
  Revenue Bill, proposals as to and effect of, *July 6*, 356.
  Russo-Japanese War — Settlement of Claims for British Vessels seized by Russian Cruisers, *July 5*, 203.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]
  Achscrabster Allotments, Expense Involved in applying for, *July 9*, 495.
  Mill of Mey Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 4*, 9.

Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B. [Yorks, E.R., Howdenshire]
  Agricultural Instruction, Facilities for, *July 9*, 523.

Harvey, Mr. A. G. C. [Rochdale]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 913, 916.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 597.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1453.

Haslam, Mr. L. [Monmouth Boroughs]
Children, Insurance of—Legislation to Limit amount Payable, proposed, *July 16*, 1335.
Merchant Shipping—Allocation of Wages, etc., Forfeited by Desertion of Seamen, *July 5*, 234.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
Crown Rents, Recovery of—Resolution, *July 16*, 1446.
Education (England & Wales) Bill—Teachers, Religious Instruction, Denominational, Power to make Agreement as to, *July 6*, 357.
Guerin, E., Case of, *July 9*, 515.
Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 1451, 1452.
Labourers, Ireland, Advances—Resolution, *July 9*, 651; *July 11*, 989, 991, 992.
Motor Omnibus Control, Legislation to deal with, proposed, *July 12*, 1172.
Treasury Vote, Date of Taking, *July 11*, 899.
Wireless Telegraphy Bill, proposals as to, *July 9*, 529.
Workmen's Trains—Proposals as to Committee Recommendations, *July 9*, 518.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
Police Attendance at Meetings, Regulations as to, *July 11*, 887, 888.

Hazel, Dr. A. E. W. [West Bromwich]
India
Calcutta Madrasseh—Qualifications of Mr. J. A. Chapman for Principalship and present position of Dr. E. D. Ross, *July 4*, 22, 23.
Educational Appointments—Qualifications of Messrs. E. Candler and W. Horne, *July 4*, 10.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]
Education (England & Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 67, 68, 77, 78, 89, 94, 95, 105, 106, 112–114.
Lunacy Grant, proposed Change in System of Paying, *July 4*, 54.
Questions, Reason for Omitting Quotation Marks from, *July 4*, 25.

Heaton, Mr. J. H. [Canterbury]
Egypt, Sanitary State of Towns—Tabling Correspondence, proposed, *July 16*, 1309.
Post Office
Money Orders—Paying at House of Addressee, proposed, *July 5*, 201.
Savings Bank—Regulations as to Deposit of Sixpence, *July 5*, 201.
Wireless Telegraphy Bill, Lords Amendments, *con.*, *July 13*, 1203, 1204.

Helme, Mr. N. W. [Lancashire, N., Lancaster]
Education [England and Wales] Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 806.

Helmsley, Lord [Yorks. N.R., Thirsk]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 749, 750, 805, 817; *July 11*, 911–913.
Transvaal, Chinese Labourers—Repatriations, Number of, *July 5*, 213.

Henderson, Mr. A. [Durham, Barnard Castle]
Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Estates, Liquor Licences on, *July 5*, 241, 242, *July 12*, 1066.
Factories, Food, Regulations as to Inspection of, *July 16*, 1336.

Henderson, Mr. J. McD. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
Ceylon Pearl Fisheries, Conditions of Leasing, *July 9*, 529.

Hendon
Telephone Exchange Service for, proposed. *Q.* Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 11*, 856, 857.

Heneage, Lord
Autumn Session, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 191.
Bills, House of Lords, Introduction into—Information as to, Measures Promised in the King's Speech, *July 5*, 190.

Herbert, Col. [Monmouthshire, S.]
Army.
Guards, Reduction in Strength of, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1148, 1149.
Personnel Reduction—Oversea Requirements the Determining Factor, *July 12*, 1148.
Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1147–1150.

Herbert, Mr. T. A. [Buck, Wycombe]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 87–89, 109; *July 9*, 609, 615; *July 10*, 791.
London Streets—Danger Arising from Cyclists Distributing Newspapers, *July 13*, 1187.

Hereford, Bishop of
Transvaal, Chinese Labourers
Crimes Committed by, Proposals as to Dealing with and Protecting White Inhabitants, *July 6*, 341.
Licences, further Issue of, Reasons for—Policy of the Government, etc., *July 6*, 339, 340, 342.
Moral Aspect of the Question, *July 6*, 342, 343.
"Slavery," Allegations of, *July 6*, 340, 341, 343.

Herrings
Ireland, Special Brand for, proposed.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 732.
Use of Title Downings Bay by Scotch Curers, Prohibition of, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 732.

Hill, Sir C. L. [Shrewsbury]
Zanzibar Mainland, Proposals for Abolishing Slavery on, *July 16*, 1332.

Historical Manuscripts.
Printing, Allocation of Contracts for.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 12*, 1042.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. H. [Bristol, E.]
Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Estates, Liquor Licences on, *July 5*, 241, 242; *July 12*, 1066.

Hogan, Mr. M. [Tipperary, N.]
Borrisokane Union—Qualifications, etc., of Mr. Haire, *July 16*, 1352.

Holdenstown
Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Sexton's Representatives.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 484.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Right. Hon. H. Gladstone.
Under-Secretary—Mr. H. Samuel.
Cunynghame, Mr. H. H. S., Duties, etc., of.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 10*, 722.

Hong Kong
Opium Farming System, Alteration in, proposed.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Churchill *July 16*, 1326, 1327.

Hope, Mr. J. D. [Fife, W.]
Motors—Revision of Rules as to Traction Engines on Highways, proposed, *July 4*, 10.

Hope, Mr. W. H. B. [Somerset, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Grant, Date of issuing Regulations as to, *July 5*, 238.

Horses
Breeding of
Foals from High Class Mares, Branding of, for purposes of Identification, proposed.
Os. Earl Carrington, *July 16*, 1293; Marquess of Londonderry, 1295.
Government Grant and Assistance to Private Societies, proposed.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 16*, 1281, 1282; Duke of Portland, 1287; Lord Saltoun, 1289; Earl of Dunraven, 1290; Earl Carrington, 1292, 1294.
Mares
Export of, to Foreign Countries, Possibility of checking.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 16*, 1279; Duke of Portland, 1286; Earl of Dunraven, 1290; Earl Carrington, 1291, 1292.
Improving Quality of—Work of Brood Mare Society, etc.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 16*, 1278–1280; Duke of Portland, 1285, 1286; Lord Ribblesdale, 1288, 1289; Lord Saltoun, 1289; Marquess of Londonderry, 1295.
Purchase of Government Stock at an earlier age, proposed.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 16*, 1283, 1284; Earl Carrington, 1293; Marquess of Londonderry, 1294.
Recommendations of Royal Commission on, giving effect to, etc., proposed.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 16*, 1276–1283; Duke of Portland, 1283–1287; Lord Ribblesdale, 1287–1289; Lord Saltoun, 1289; Earl Carrington, 1290–1294.
Report of Hunters' Improvement Society.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 16*, 1277, 1280–1282.
Sires, Provision of Improved Class of proposed.
Os. Earl of Donoughmore, *July 16*, 1278; Earl of Dunraven 1289, 1290.

House of Commons
See under Parliament.

House of Lords
See under Parliament.

Huddersfield Corporation Bill
l. 3 R.* *July 9*, 425.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 13*, 1181.

Hudson, Mr. W. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
Armagh Locomotive Boiler Explosion, Result of Inquiry into, *July 9*, 519.
Vaccination, Primary, Fees for—Revision of Law, proposed, *July 9*, 522.

Hull and Barnsley Railway (Steam Vessels) Bill
c. 3R.* *July 5*, 197.
l. Commons Amendts. *Con.** *July 6*, 334.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Yeomanry Drill Book—Revision of Present Instructions, proposed, *July 16*, 1308.

Income Tax
American Beef Companies, Assessment of.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 9*, 496, 497.
Arrears, Regulations as to clearing-up.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 12*, 1031.
Assessment and Collection System.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 12*, 1033.
Commissioners, Control over Officials, etc., of.
Q. Mr. Sears; A. Mr. McKenna, *July 10*, 725, 726.
Estimate of Percentage of Assessments corrected during last five years, proposed.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 12*, 1032.

India
Army
Execution of Soldiers—Case of Private of 1st Lincolns.
Qs. Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. J. Ellis, *July 16*, 1324, 1325.
Penson, H. J., case of.
Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 5*, 224, 225.
Bengal
Boycott of British Goods, alleged.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 9*, 508.
Partition of—Local Opinion, etc.
Q. Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 5*, 222, 223.

India—*cont.*
Bengal, Eastern
"Bande Mataram," Regulations as to Prohibition of Annoyance by shouting.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 4*, 12.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Ellis, *July 16*, 1323, 1324.
British Import Trade Statistics.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 4*, 12.
Legislative Council—Representation of Planting Interest.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 5*, 222.
Processions and Public Meetings, Restrictions on.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 5*, 220, 221.
Swadeshi Movement, Repressive Measures against, alleged.
Qs. Sir H. Cotton, Dr. Rutherford; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 5*, 221.
Budget Discussion, Facilities for.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 10*, 739.
Viceregal Council, Time allotted to.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 9*, 510.
Calcutta Madrasseh Principalship—Qualifications of Mr. J. A. Chapman and present position of Dr. E. D. Ross.
Qs. Dr. Hazel; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 4*, 22, 23.
Education
Appointments and Qualifications of Messrs. E. Candler and W. Horne.
Q. Dr. Hazel; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 4*, 10.
Indian Languages Examinations, Tabling Amended Regulations for, proposed.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 5*, 222.
Guzerat and the Deccan, Rainfall and Monsoon Forecast for.
Q. Mr. T. H. Davies; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 10*, 711.
Judicial and Executive Functions, Decision as to Separation of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 4*, 11.
Leopards and Tigers, Discontinuance of Rewards for Killing, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. J. Ellis, *July 10*, 717.
Moral and Material Progress—Discontinuance of Annual Statement proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 9*, 509.

[*cont.*

India—*cont.*
Natives, Outrages by—Sentences on Assailants of Mr. Earle and Murderer of Mr. Goss.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley *July 9*, 509.
Prisoner Executed while awaiting Answer to Appeal, *see* Assam—Udoy Patni.
Public Works Department Appointments—Nationality, etc., of Candidates.
Q. Sir J. Jardine; *A.* Mr. Ellis *July 16*, 1326.
Place of Education of Candidates.
Q. Sir P. Magnus; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 12*, 1048.
Railways
Raipur-Vizianagram Scheme — Decision as to Improving Vizagapatam Harbour.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. J. Ellis, *July 11*, 874.
Rolling Stock, Alleged Inadequacy of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. J. Ellis, *July 10*, 717.
Vizamgam-Malia Line, Reconnaissance of Routes for.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 5*, 202..
Revenue Accounts and Papers Presented to Parliament during Session to be referred to Committee of Whole House *July 9*, 534.
Sailors and Soldiers killed or wounded in Warlike Operations during years 1898–1903—Return Presented, *July 16*, 1298.
Textile Mills, Conditions of Labour in—Result of Inquiry etc.
Q. Mr. Gill; *A.* Mr. Morley, *July 4*, 11.
Waste Land, Rules for Reclamation of.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley *July 4*, 22.

India Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. J. Morley.
Under Secretary—Rt. Hon. J. E. Ellis.

Inebriates Acts, 1879-1900, Scotland
Report for 1905, Presented, *July 16*, 1275, 1299.

Infectious Diseases
Inquiries by Friends of Patients in Hospital, Regulations as to.
Q. Sir J. Jardine; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 9*, 519, 520.

Inny, Upper
Drainage Board, Constitution and Work of.
Q. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July* , 1043.

Insurance
Children, *see that title*,

Inverclyde, Lord
Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Brother, *July 12*, 993.

Ireland
Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon. J. Bryce.
Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.
Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.
Solicitor-General—Mr. R. Barry.
(*See also names of places.*)
Administrative Boards, Return as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 705, 706.
Ancient Order of Hibernians, Seditious Actions of, Connection with United Irish League.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 12*, 1012–1014; Lord Denman, 1019.
Congested Districts—Commission of Inquiry, Scope of.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 734.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce *July 12*, 1067.
Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*
Education, *see title* Education—Ireland.
Fines Accounted for by Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks for 1904—Abstract of Accounts Presented, *July 4*, 8; *July 5*, 161.
Fisheries, *see under title* Fisheries.
Home Rule, Legislative proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 4*, 59.
Q. Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 733.
Land Act, Land Commission, Land Judge's Court, Land Purchase, *see those titles.*
Magistrates, *see under title* Magistrates and Justices of the Peace.
Prisons, *see that title.*
Return No. 173 of 1903, Information Contained in.
Q. Col. M'Calmont; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 48.
Royal Canal, Condition of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 49.
Sinn Fein, Policy of.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 12*, 1014, 1015.
Trade Statistics, facilities for compiling.
Qs. Mr. Boland; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George. *July 4*, 57, 58.
Trinity College Commission—Qualifications of Dr. D. Hyde.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Bryce, Mr. Speaker, *July 11*, 889, 890.

Irish Tobacco Bill
c. 1R.* *July 9*, 535.

Isle of Man (Customs) Bill
c. 2R. *July 16*, 1451.

Italy
Import Duties on Machinery and Bar Iron
Q. Mr. Armitage; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 4*, 15, 16.

Jacoby, Mr. J. A. [Derbyshire, Mid]
House of Commons Kitchen Committee' Laundries Employed by, *July 10*, 727.

James of Hereford, Lord
Ground Game Bill, *Com. July 12*, 1000, 1001.

Japan
British Alliance with.
Os. Sir E. Sassoon, *July 5*, 302; Sir E. Grey, 317.
Shimonoseki—Trade Report Presented, *July 16*, 1275.

Jardine, Sir J. [Roxburghshire]
Ceylon Pearl Fisheries Question, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 10*, 739.
India—Public Works Department Appointments—Nationality of Candidates, *July 16*, 1326.
Infectious Diseases—Inquiries by Friends of Patients in Hospitals, Regulations as to, *July 9*, 519.
Lunatic Asylums, Scottish—Superannuation Rights of Officials, *July 16*, 1347.

Johnson, Mr. J. [Gateshead]
Vaccination Fees, proposals for Reduction of, *July 12*, 1062.

Joint Stock Companies
Return relating to, Ordered, *July 16*, 1300–1302.

Jones, Mr. L. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
Army—Casualties during Route March of Buffs in April, *July 9*, 500.
Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Licences on Estates of, *July 12*, 1066.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com. July 9*, 562, 565, 593; *July 10*, 792, 800.
Macedonia, Condition of—Proposals as to *Gendarmerie*, etc., *July 9*, 511.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
Kilfinane School, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 244.

Juvenile Offenders
Separate Treatment, etc., Legislative Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. H. J. Tennant; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 10*, 710.

Juvenile Smoking
Report from Select Committee, Presented, *July 9*, 471.

Kearley, Mr. H. C.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Trade* [Devonport]
Emigration and Immigration Report, Date of Issuing, *July 11*, 856.
Great Northern (Ireland) Railway—Lack of Third Class Carriages and Sanitary Accommodation, alleged, *July 13*, 1187, 1188.
Lights and Lighthouses, Advisory Committee, Constitution of, *July 11*, 862.
Patent Agents—Number Registered, Names erased, etc., *July 11*, 860.
Shropshire, Worcestershire and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill, 2R. *July 10*, 851, 852.
Taw and Torridge Estuary, Control of Lighting of, *July 11*, 863.
Trinity House, Board of Trade Control over, *July 11*, 862.

Kekewich, Sir G. W. [Exeter]
Exmouth—Case of Mrs. Hunt, *July 9*, 516.
Great Yarmouth Parliamentary Election Petition Proceedings at Trial, Allegations against Mr. Justice Grantham, *July 6*, 376–378.
Political Bias and Partisanship, Charges of, *July 6*, 377.

Kenlis, Lord
Took the Oath, *July 5*, 425.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W]
Ballinamore—Police Assistance at Eviction of Mr. P. McLoughlin, *July 16*, 1350.
Cavan Evicted Tenants—Reinstatements Effected, etc., *July 16*, 1353.
Coolkill and Toneylion—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Coyle, *July 16*, 1355.
Drumcoo—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. E. McGuire, *July 12*, 1041.
Emigration from Ireland during 1906, *July 16*, 1350.
Land Commission—Additional Judicial Commissioner, Appointment of, Proposed, *July 5*, 245, 246.
Land Purchase—Mining and Mineral Rights, Decision as to power to dispose of, *July 16*, 1306.
Omnibus and Tram Ticket Prizes, Legality of, etc., *July 9*, 514.

Kent
Light Railway Construction in—Orders Presented, *July 5*, 335, 354.
Mid-Kent Water Provisional Order—Board of Trade Report Presented, *July 9*, 471, 480.

Kent Electric Power Bill
c. 2R.* *July 9*, 478.
*Rep.** *July 16*, 1297.

Kettering Water Bill
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 4*, 1.

Kew Gardens
Gardeners, Rate of Wages paid to.
Os. Mr. Summerbell, *July 13*, 1223; Sir E. Strachey, 1229.
Guide to, Preparation of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Chiozza Money; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 16*, 1312.
Hours of Opening on Sunday.
Qs. Mr. Chiozza Money; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 5*, 240, 241; *July 12*, 1064.
Police in, day of rest for, proposed.
Os. Mr. Summerbell, *July 13*, 1224.
Refreshments, Improvement in, proposed.
Q. Mr. Chiozza Money; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 16*, 1312.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
Athy Post Office Site, Decision as to, *July 5*, 248.
Clanricarde Estate—Reinstatement Claim of P. Fahy, *July 9*, 484.
Congested Districts Board Records, Confidential Nature of, *July 4*, 44.
Deane-Drake Estate — Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Kavanagh, *July 5*, 242, 243.
Labourers (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill, Effect of, *July 4*, 52.

Kilfinane
School, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Lundon, Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 244.

Kilkeary
Land Commission Holdings—Rent Agreements of Tenants, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Mara; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 45, 46.

Kilkenny
Officers' Quarters and Mess, Allocation of Contracts for furnishing.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9*, 488.
Reinstatement Claims, Number of, etc.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 485.

Kilmaine, Lord, Estate of
Land Purchase Case, Date of hearing, etc.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1041.

King Harman Estate
Ballinamuck Portion—Terms of Purchase.
Q. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 248.

King's County
Assizes—Crier's Fee in Case of Young *v.* Brennan.
Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 733.

Kingston Estate
Coracunna Farm Dispute, Settlement of, Reason for Retention of Police Post, etc.
Qs. Mr. W. Abraham; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 892, 893.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill
c. *Con.** and 3R* *July 4*, 1.
l. 1R.* *July 5*, 158.
Report from Attorney-General, *July 10*, 653.
2R. *July 12*, 993.

Kinvara Harbour
Harbour Works, Decision as to.
Qs. Mr. Duffy, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Bryce, Mr. Speaker, *July 9*, 531–533.

Knutsford, Viscount
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 1254–1255.

Labourers, Ireland
Advances—Resolution.
Os. Mr. C. Hay, Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 651; Mr. C. Hay, *July 11*, 989, 991, 992; Mr. J. Redmond, 989; Mr. Bryce, 990, 991, 992; Sir E. Carson, 990; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 991, 992; Mr. T. W. Russell, *July 11*, 991; Mr. W. Redmond, 992; Captain Craig, *July 16*, 1444, 1445; Mr. J. Redmond, 1445; Mr. Speaker, 1445.
Committee, *July 13*, 1202—Report, *July 16*, 1443.

Labourers (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill
Amendments as to Untenanted Land, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 40.
Extension of, to Urban Districts, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 500.
Farmers, Facilities to, for Loans for Improvements to Dwellings, etc., proposed.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Kilbride; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 51, 52.

Lamberts Minors Estate
Proposals for Sale of.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1307, 1308.

Lambton, Mr. F. W. [Durham, S.E.]
Education (England & Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1399.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]
- Sliddery Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 9*, 482.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill
- c. *Rep.* July 5*, 198.
- *Con.* July 12*, 1027.
- 3R.* *July 16*, 1296.

Land Commission, Ireland
- [*For particular estates, see their names.*]
- Commissioners
  - Additional Judicial Commissioner, Appointment of, proposed.
    - *Qs.* Mr. V. Kennedy, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. T. W. Russell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 245, 246.
  - Temporary Assistant—Land Valuations by on Expiration of Term of Office.
    - *Qs.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 890, 891.
- Postcards, Official, Alleged Use of, by Ex-Sub-Commissioner.
  - *Qs.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 1*, 892, 893.
- Procedure in Fixing Rents.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 885, 886.

Land Judge's Court
- Estates over which Receivers have been appointed—Return ordered, *July 11*, 856.

Land Purchase, Ireland
- *See also Names of Estates, etc.*
- Compulsory Declaration as Purchaser, Number of Cases of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 883.
- Correspondence with Estates Commissioners—Access to, by Landlords and Tenants.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1349.
- Estates Commissioners
  - Instructions to, Authorship of.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1067, 1068.
- Mining, Mineral and Sporting Rights, Decision as to power of disposal of.
  - *Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1306, 1307.
- Price, Equity of—Reason for not referring Cases of Disagreement to Judicial Decision.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 884.
- Tenants' Improvements, Protection of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 885.

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*
- Untenanted Land Return
  - Inclusion of Evicted Farms.
    - *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 883.
  - Scope of, etc.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 39, 40.
- Zones, Price within—Effect of King Harman *v.* Hayes Case, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 47.

Land Registry
- Accounts of Receipts and Payments Presented, *July 5*, 161, 199.

Land Tenure Bill
- Policy of the Government as to.
  - *Os.* Viscount Sidmouth, *July 5*, 183; Lord Burghclere, 187.

Lane-Fox, Mr. G. [Yorks, W.R., Barkston Ash]
- Africa, South, Garrison in—Bloemfontein Transport Deficiencies, *July 9*, 501.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 587, 588; *July 10*, 798, 806; *July 11*, 930, 931.
  - Clause 10, Subsection (2), Amendment of, proposed, *July 16*, 1344, 1345.
  - Teachers' Agreements, Enforcement of etc., *July 9*, 526, 527.

Lansdowne, Marquess of
- Bills
  - House of Lords, Introduction into.
    - Measures promised in the King's Speech, Information as to, *July 5*, 172–179.
    - Origination of more Measures in the Lords, proposed, *July 5*, 178.
    - Period for, Inadequate Time for Discussion under Present System, etc., *July 5*, 174–180.
- Business of the House
  - King's Speech, Measures promised in, Information as to, Date of bringing to the House of Lords, etc., *July 5*, 172–179.
- Compulsory Military Service, Proposals as to—Cost of the Scheme, etc., *July 10*, 696.
- Defence of the Empire
  - Home Defence, Navy as Sole Means of—Supplementing by Increased Land Defence, proposed, *July 10*, 696, 698.
  - Unpreparedness of the Nation for War, alleged, *July 10*, 697.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, Date of Introduction in the House of Lords—Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 175–177.

[*cont*

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*cont.*
Ground Game Bill, *Com. July 12*, 998–1000.
London County Council
  Expenditure, Enormous Increase in, *July 9*, 464, 465.
  Financial Methods of—*Status* of Credit, etc., *July 9*, 463–468.
  Steamboat Service, Excess of Expenditure over Estimate and Receipts, *July 9*, 467.
  Undertakings of, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates, *July 9*, 466.
London County Council (Money) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 463–468.
Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill
  Date of sending to the Lords, allowing adequate Time for Discussion, etc,, *July 5*, 177.
Parliamentary Procedure
  Autumn Session, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 175, 176, 197.
    Course of Business during, *July 5* 176, 179.
Plural Voting Bill—Date of Introduction in the House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 177, 178.
Trade Unions and Trade Disputes Bills, Date of Introduction in the House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 177.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour
  Licences, Further Issue of, Reasons for Policy of the Government, etc., *July 6*, 347, 348.
  Slavery, Allegations of, *July 6*, 347.
Unemployed Workmen Amendment Bill—Policy of the Government as to, *July 5*, 178.
Workmen's Compensation Bill—Date of Introduction in the House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 177.

Laundries
House of Commons Kitchen Committee Laundries employed by.
  Q. Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Jacoby, *July 10*, 726, 727.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal, W.]
Army Recruits, under age—Case of M. McGarvey, *July 10*, 715.
Cleggan—Erection of Letter Box, proposed, *July 9*, 483.
Dunmore, Purchase Negotiations for, *July 11*, 890.
Herrings—Use of title Downing's Bay by Scotch Curers, alleged, *July 10*, 732.
Maghery Bay—Reply to Memorial as to Boat Slip, *July 9*, 499.
Railway Inquiry, Proposals as to and scope of, *July 16*, 1356.

Law Courts
Court of Appeal—Accounts showing Receipts and Expenditure, Presented *July 5*, 162, 199.
High Court of Justice—Accounts showing Receipts and Expenditure, Presented *July 5*, 162, 199.
Trials by Jury—Introduction of Scottish System, proposed.
  Q. Mr. E. Wason; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *July 5*, 240.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]
Army
  Courts Martial—Regulations as to Murder Trials abroad, *July 12*, 1037.
  Executions in Public, Prohibition of proposed, *July 12*, 1037.
Burmah—Court-Martial Sentence on Corporal of Second Border Regiment, *July 16*, 1324.
Colonial Marriages Bill, Proposals as to *July 16*, 1321.
Indian Army—Execution of Private of 1st Lincolns, Circumstances of, *July 16*, 1324, 1325.
Wireless Telegraphy—Date of circulating, Return as to working, *July 4*, 19.

Leader Estate
Reinstatement Claims of D. Fitzpatrick and Mrs. Cronin.
  Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 45.

Leckhampton
Right of Way Disturbances—Sentences inflicted, etc.
  Q. Mr. S. Collins; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 11*, 875, 876.
  Qs. Mr. Essex, Mr. Sears; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 12*, 1059.

Leefin
Grazing Farm, Disposal of.
  Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16* 1302.

Lehmann, Mr. R. C. [Leicester, Market Harborough]
Natal Native Rising—Treatment of Zulu Wounded, *July 16*, 1360.
Vaccination—Sentences on Bray, Vann and Bruin, *July 16*, 1341.

Leigh, Lord
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 3R., *July* 16, 1250.

Leith of Fyvie, Lord
London County Council (General Powers Bill), 3R., *July 16*, 1265, 1666.

Lever, Mr. A. L. [Essex, Harwich]
Army
Expansion, Necessity for, *July 12* 1152.
Expenditure—Reduction of, Necessity for, and Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1152.
Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1151–1154.
Volunteers, Organisation and Training of, Necessity for Reform in, *July 12*, 1152–1154.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]
Emigration and Immigration Report, Date of Issuing, *July 11*, 856.

Lewis Estate
Negotiations for Sale of.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 730.

Lewis, Island of
Local Taxation, Date of Tabling Report on.
Qs. Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 4*, 38, 39.
Medical Inspector's Report (1895–1904) Date of Tabling.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 4*, 39.
Medical and Sanitary Staff, Proposals as to Reorganisation of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 4*, 17, 18.

Light Railways Act, 1896
Advances under, Amount of.
Q. Mr. Thornton; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 5*, 204.

Lights and Lighthouse
Advisory Committee, Constitution of.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 11*, 862.

Limerick
Evicted Tenants, Inquiry into Cases of.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 55.
Fair Rent Appeals, Decision of Court as to.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 55, 56.
Post Office Learner, Reason for Resignation of.
Qs. Mr. Delany; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 10*, 737, 738.

Lisburn
Workhouse Officials—Decision as to Inquiry.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 858.

Llanelian
School Teacher, Salary of.
Q. Mr. F. E. Smith; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 9*, 524.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*President of the Board of Trade* [Carnarvon, etc.]
Armagh Locomotive Boiler Explosion. Result of Inquiry into, *July 9*, 519.
Birmingham—Inquiry into Death of Mr. Yardley at Vauxhall Station, *July 5*, 234.
Canals Royal Commission, Irish Representation on, *July 9*, 534.
German State Railways, Information as to, *July 9*, 518.
Italian Import Dutieson Machinery and Bar Iron, *July 4*, 16.
Merchant Shipping
Rebates, Proposals as to Inquiry into, *July 16*, 1343.
Seamen—Desertion, Allocation of Wages, etc., Forfeited by, *July 5*, 235.
Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill, Date of taking, *July 5*, 235.
Railways
Banking Trains up Inclines by Uncoupled Engines, Dangers of, *July 5*, 236.
Ireland
Clearing House Returns, Information Contained in, *July 16*, 1315.
Commission of Inquiry, Proposals as to, *July 16*, 1316.
London and South Western Company —Penalties on Engine Drivers, *July 5*, 233.
Metropolitan District Trains, Length of, *July 5*, 205.
Rates etc., Complaints as to—Alteration of Present System proposed, *July 9*, 492.
Statistics as to, *July 9*, 518.
Trade and Commerce—Irish Statistics, Facilities for Compiling, *July 4*, 58.
Workmen's Trains—Proposals as to Committee Recommendations, *July 9*, 519.

Local Authorities (Qualifications of Women) Bill
Proposals as to.
Q. Dr. Shipman; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 896, 897.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. J. Burns,
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. W. Runciman.

Local Government Board (Ireland)
Accounts of Local Authorities, Date of and Fees for Auditing, etc.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh ; *A.* Mr. ryce, *July 16*, 1317.
Inspectors, Information as to—Return proposed.
Q. Mr. Ginnell ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 884.
Return, Ordered, *July 12*, 1030.

Local Government Provisional Order (Housing of the Working Classes) Bill
l. 2R.* *July* 9, 426.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 9*, 426.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 12*, 994.

Local Government Provisional Order (No. 10) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 11*, 853.
3R.* *July 12*, 1027.
l. 1R.* *July 12*, 995.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 9*, 426.

Local Government (Scotland) Act (1894) Amendment Bill
c. Order for Second Reading Read, etc., and Bill withdrawn, *July 4*, 60.

Locherbie
Town Hall Bazaar, alleged Raffling at.
Q. Mr. Alden ; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *July 11*, 856.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
Army
Coldstream Guards—Arrangements for Despatch of Battalion to Egypt, *July 16*, 1322.
Guards—Reduction in Strength of, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1150, 1151.
Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1150–1151.

London
Street Traffic, *see that title.*

London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Bill
l. *Rep.** *July 12*, 994.

London County Buildings Bill
l. 3R.* *July 9*, 425.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 13*, 1181.

London County Council
Electric Supply Undertakings, Excess of Expenditure over Estimate.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 9*, 432–434 ; Lord Welby, 442.

Expenditure of, Enormous Increase in.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 9*, 426–436 ; Lord Avebury, 447, 449 ; Earl Carrington, 460 ; Marquess of Lansdowne, 464, 465.

Financial Committee of—Recommendations of, Ignored, alleged.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 9*, 435–438 ; Lord Welby, 438–440 ; Lord Monkswell, 455.

Financial Methods of—*Status* of Credit, etc.
Os. Lord Welby, *July 9*, 444–446 ; Lord Avebury, 447–449 ; Lord Ludlow, 451, 452 ; Viscount Goschen, 452, 453 ; Lord Monkswell, 455 ; Earl of Donoughmore, 456–459 ; Earl Carrington, *July 9*, 460–463 ; Lord Stanley of Alderley, 463 ; Marquess of Lansdowne, 463–468 ; Marquess of Ripon, 468–270.

Housing Schemes, Buildings, etc.—Excess of Expenditure over Estimate.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 9*, 434 ; Lord Welby, 442 ; Lord Avebury, 448, 449 ; Lord Monkswell, 456 ; Earl Carrington, 462.

Loans, Borrowing Powers for £12,224,000
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 9*, 428 ; Lord Welby, 444 ; Earl Carrington, 461.

Main Drainage Schemes, Cost of.
Os. Lord Welby, *July 9*, 446.

Steamboat Service, Excess of Expenditure over Estimate and Receipts.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 9*, 429, 430 ; Lord Welby, 440 ; Lord Monkswell, 455 ; Marquess of Lansdowne, 467.

Traffic Board, Establishment of, proposed.
Os. Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, *July 9*, 450, 451.

Tramway Services
Excess of Expenditure over Estimates and Receipts.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 9*, 430, 431 ; Lord Welby, 441 ; Lord Avebury, 447 ; Lord Ludlow, 451.
Motor Omnibus Competition.
Os. Lord Montagu of Beaulieu, *July 9*, 450.

[*cont.*

London County Council—*cont.*
Undertakings of, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 9*, 428–435; Lord Welby, 440–444; Lord Avebury, 447–449; Earl of Donoughmore, 457, 458; Marquess of Lansdowne, 466.

London County Council (General Powers) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 12*, 993.
3R., *July 16*, 1243.
Ambulance Service, Granting Power to Establish and Maintain, proposed.
Os. Lord Monkswell, *July 16*, 1243–1250, 1258, 1259; Lord Leigh, 1250; Earl of Camperdown, 1251–1254; Viscount Knutsford, 1254; Earl of Onslow, 1255; Earl Beauchamp, 1256–1258.
Supply of Electric Fittings by Metropolitan Borough Councils — Omission of Clauses 27, 28, and 29, proposed.
Os. Earl of Wemyss, *July 16*, 1259–1262; Earl of Camperdown, 1262, 1263; Lord Clinton, 1263–1265; Lord Leith of Fyvie, 1265, 1266; Duke of Northumberland, 1266; Earl of Granard, 1268; Earl of Onslow, 1268, 1269.

London County Council (Money) Bill
l. 2R., *July 9*, 426.

Schedules to, Terms of.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *July 9*, 427, 428.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 13*, 1173.

London Electric Supply Corporation Bill
c. Order for Second Reading Read, etc., and Bill withdrawn, *July 12*, 1027.

London Government Schemes (London and Penge, &c.) Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *July 10*, 653.

London and India Docks and Millwall Dock Companies Bill
c. Withdrawn, *July 4*, 2.

London and North Western Railway Bill
c. Con. July 5*, 197.
3 R.* *July 9*, 478.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 10*, 654.

London and South Western Railway Bill
l. 3R. *July 9*, 425.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 13*, 1181.

London Southern Tramways Bill
c. Order for Committee read, etc, and Bill withdrawn, *July 12*, 1027.

London Squares and Enclosures Bill
l. Rep. July 10*, 653.
3R.* *July 16*, 1242.
c. 1R.* *July 16*, 1298.

London United Tramways Bill
l. 3R.* *July 16*, 1242.

Londonderry, Marquess of
Horse Breeding, Government Assistance and Encouragement of, proposed, *July 16*, 1294, 1295.
Magistrates, Ireland
Disloyal Speeches by, Inciting to Illegal and Criminal Acts, *July 12*, 1025.
Procedure as to Appointment of, *July 12*, 1025.

Long, Mr. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 924–927, 941, 943, 945, 967–969.

Longford
Post Office Hours of Business, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 4*, 57.

Lonsdale, Earl of
Took the Oath, *July 13*, 1173.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]
Abbeyleix — Inquiry into Allegations against Head Constable Spence, *July 4*, 52.
Abyssinia—Railway, etc., Agreement, Negotiations as to, *July 12*, 1054.
Africa, South—Date of announcing Self-Government Proposals, *July 12*, 1072.
Ballinamore Rate Collector—Appointment of Mr. P. Curran, *July 4*, 50.
Bann River Drainage Proposals, *July 16*, 1351.
Cape Colony—Maraisburg School Board, Alleged Dismissal of English Teachers by, *July 16*, 1328, 1329.
Colonial Conference 1907, Subjects to be discussed at, *July 16*, 1358.
Cornamona—Decision in Case of Mr. M. O'Malley, *July 11*, 888.
Craughwell—Stone thrown at Window of Mrs. Ryan, *July 11*, 888.
Drumraney—Alleged Attack on House of J. Cassells, *July 12*, 1068.

[*cont.*

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.—*cont.*
  Dublin Corporation
    Irish Language, Use of, on Rolling Stock, *July 12*, 1034.
    Refusal of Access of Local Government Auditor to Books, alleged, *July 11*, 894.
  Education
    Consultative Committee, Constitution of, *July 4*, 49.
    School Building Grants, Decision as to, *July 4*, 50.
  Elphin United Irish League Meeting, Speeches at, Attendance of Police, etc., *July 11*, 886–888.
  Glenties Union Clerk, Increase of Salary of, *July 16*, 1348.
  Home Rule, Legislative Proposals as to, *July 4*, 59.
  Labourers (Ireland) Bill—Loans to Farmers for Improvements to Dwellings, etc., proposed, *July 4*, 51.
  Merchant Shipping Rebates, Proposals as to Inquiry into, *July 16*, 1343.
  Natal Native Rising—Mr. K. Hardie's letter, *July 11*, 872.
  Nigerian Railway Extension, Decision as to, *July 12*, 1050.
  Post Office—Australian Mail Service Contract, Terms of, *July 12*, 1062.
  Sinai Peninsula—Progress made with Delimitation of Turco-Egyptian Frontier, *July 16*, 1332.
  Trinity College Commission—Qualifications of Dr. D. Hyde, *July 11*, 889, 890.
  Waterloo Battlefield, Alleged Sale of Portion of—Representations to Belgian Government, proposed, *July 16*, 1333.
  Woodford United Irish League Meeting, Speeches made at, *July 4*, 52.

Lord Advocate for Scotland
  Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.

Lord Chamberlain
  Viscount Althorp.

Lord Chancellor
  Lord Loreburn.

Lord Chief Justice
  Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain
  Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland
  Earl of Aberdeen.

Lord President of the Council.
  Earl of Crewe.

Lord Privy Seal
  Marquess of Ripon.

Lord Tredegar's Supplemental Estate Bill
  c. 2R.* *July 9*, 478.

Lord Warden of the Duchy of Cornwall
  Earl of Ducie.

Loreburn, Lord—*Lord Chancellor*
  Criminal Appeal Bill, *Rep.*, *July 10*, 656; 3R., *July 12*, 1005–1008.

Lost Property
  Rewards for Finding, Sending to Finder by Post, proposed.
    Q. Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 4*, 32.

Lough, Mr. T. *Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education.* [Islington, W.]
  Citizenship, Proposals for Teaching, *July 5*, 237.
  Code—Interpretation of Article 38 (IV.), *July 12*, 1040.
  Dipton Catholic School Inquiry, Result of, *July 4*, 36, 37.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 124, 126; *July 9*, 611; *July 11*, 948, 950, 951, 952; *July 16*, 1424.
    Grant, Date of Issuing Regulations as to, *July 5*, 238.
  Fire Drill, Regulations as to counting Time spent in, *July 12*, 1039.
  Switzerland—Vaccination Regulations for Teachers, *July 4*, 36.
  Wakefield—Fees charged in St. John's School, *July 12*, 1063.
  Welsh Intermediate Schools, Treasury Grant to, *July 4*, 36.

Loughrea
  Town Hall, Ownership and use of.
    Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1034.

Lovat, Lord
  Compulsory Military Service, Proposals as to—Cost of the Scheme, etc., *July 10*, 689.
  Ground Game Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 1001.

Lunacy
  Ireland—Grants, Effect of proposed Change in System of Paying.
    Qs. Captain Donelan, Mr. Healy, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 53, 54.

[*cont.*

Lunacy—*cont.*
Number of Visits made and Patients seen—Return Presented, *July 4*, 8; *July 5*, 161.
Scotland—Officers, etc., of Asylums, Superannuation Rights of.
Qs. Mr. Gulland, Sir J. Jardine; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 16*, 1347.

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill
Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1355.

Ludlow, Lord
London County Council.
Financial Methods—*Status* of Credit, etc., *July 9*, 451, 452.
Tramway Services, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates and Receipts, *July 9*, 451.
London County Council (Money) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 451, 452.

Lundon, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]
Agricultural Organisation Society, Grants to—Statements as to Expenditure, *July 16*, 1354.
Agriculture Department—Experimental Farms, Profit and Loss on, *July 16*, 1354.
Ballynanty—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Hartigan, *July 5*, 244.
Bettyville Manister — Reinstatement Claim of Mr. E. Hartigan, *July 10*, 731.
Kilfinane School, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 244.
North Camas—Reinstatement Claims of C. Walsh and J. Tooney, *July 4*, 48.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 933; *July 16*, 1370.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 652; *July 16*, 1455, 1465, 1466, 1467, 1483, 1486.
Opium Trade in British Possessions, Prohibition of, proposed, *July 16*, 1327.
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Corporal Punishment, Necessity for, *July 4*, 27.
Vaccination
Exemption Certificates.
Case of Mr. S. Priestley, *July 9*, 515.
Number granted, *July 11*, 877.
Switzerland, Regulations in, Statistics as to cases of Small-pox, etc., *July 4*, 12, 28, 33, 35, 36.
Wireless Telegraphy Bill, Lords' Amend. Con., *July 13*, 1207.

Luttrell, Mr. H. F. [Devon, Tavistock]
Dartmoor—Artillery Practice on Public Holidays, *July 9*, 488.

Lyell, Mr. C. H. [Dorset, E.]
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1462.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
Africa, South.
Papers on, Date of Tabling, *July 11*, 864.
Self-Government Proposals.
Mode of carrying out of, etc., *July 11*, 864.
Opportunity for Discussion, Precedent for granting Letters Patent, etc., *July 16*, 1357, 1358.
Ceylon Pearl Fisheries, Conditions of Leasing, *July 5*, 217.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.* *July 9*, 624.

McCalmont, Col. J. [Antrim, E.]
Return No. 173 of 1903, Information contained in, *July 4*, 48.

Macdonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester]
Education—Training Colleges, Vaccination Regulations in, *July 11*, 881.
Education and (England Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1417–1419, 1426, 1427, 1431.
Marlborough Street Police Court—Fine imposed on Cab-driver Simmons, *July 9*, 517.
Natal, Bill of Indemnity, Provisions of, *July 16*, 1326.
Transvaal Chinese Labourers.
Cason Mine—Charges against Mr. Jamieson, etc., *July 11*, 871.
Corporal Punishment—New Comet Mine Case, Information as to, *July 4*, 27.
Vaccination of Pupil Teachers—Regulations as to Conscientious Objection, *July 16*, 1345.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berkshire, Newbury]
Transvaal
Chinese Labourers
Botha, General, Letter from and Reply to, *July 9*, 505.
Corporal Punishment—Witthauer, Decision as to Prosecution of, *July 4*, 26.
Crimes.
Measures for Protection of White People, etc., *July 11*, 870.
Number of, etc., *July 11*, 874.

[cont.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C.—*cont.*
  Transvaal—*cont.*
    Chinese Labourers—*cont.*
      Desertions, Number of, *July 5*, 213.
      Nourse Deep Mine Riot, Information as to, *July 11*, 870.
    Gaols, White Men, Kaffirs, and Chinese in, *July 12*, 1052, 1053.
    Rand—Information as to alleged Outrage on White People by Kaffirs and Chinese, *July 14*, 1329.
  Vivisection Royal Commission, proposals as to, *July 16*, 1335.

McKean, Mr. J. [Monhagan, S.]
  Congo Free State, Belgian Administration of—Charges of ill-treatment of Natives, etc., *July 5*, 266–279.
  Dromod Police Hut, Abolition of, proposed, *July 12*, 1069.
  Smith, Captain, Estate of—Case of A Beggan, *July 12*, 1070.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*Financial Secretary of the Treasury* [Monmouth, N.]
  Civil Service
    Abstractor Clerks—Regulations as to Counting Service for Pension, *July 4*, 37.
    Boy Clerks.
      Appointments, Dismissals, etc., of *July 16*, 1310.
      Examinations, Information as to, *July 4*, 20.
  Customs and Excise
    Statistical Office—Decision as to Memorial from new class Assistant Clerks, *July 16*, 1310.
    Supervisorship Examinations, Information as to, *July 9*, 492.
  Crown Lands (Recovery of Crown Rents)—Resolution, *July 16*, 1446.
  Dog Tax, Officials responsible for assessing, Effect of Acts of 1867 and 1869, etc., *July 5*, 239, 240.
  Edinburgh Inspectors of Taxes Office—Pension Claim of Clerk, *July 6*, 358.
  Estate Duty, Recovery of Omissions and Under-estimates, *July 10*, 726.
  Government Departments, Ireland, Second Division Clerks appointed to (1901–1906), *July 9*, 491.
  Historical Manuscripts—Allocation of Printing Contracts, *July 12*, 1042.
  House of Commons Lighting, etc., Department Employees, Pension Claims of, *July 5*, 202.
  Income Tax Commissioners, Control over Officials, etc., of, *July 10*, 726.
  Isle of Man (Customs) Bill, 2R., *July 16*, 1452.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*cont.*
  Light Railways Act, 1896, Advances under, *July 5*, 204.
  National Physical Laboratory, Work undertaken by, *July 13*, 1185.
  Street Traffic Commission Report, Cost of Publishing, *July 9*, 527, 528.
  Taxation Assessments—Percentage revised and amended, *July 5*, 239.
  Taw and Torridge Estuary—Gravel, Dues received for Removal of, *July 11*, 861.
  Whitburn—Complaints as to tipping Collery Refuse on Foreshore, *July 5*, 238.

Maclean, Mr. D. [Bath]
  Navy—"Montagu," Prospects of Floating, etc., *July 4*, 21.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
  Education—Cost in heavily rated Areas—Grants available (1906–7) and Work of Committee of Inquiry, *July 11*, 879, 880.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 766, 767, 775, 776, 778, 789, 790, 799, 824; *July 11*, 905–907; *July 16*, 1382, 1383, 1398, 1399, 1405, 1427–1429, 1431.
    Teachers' Superannuation Claims under amended form of Clause 4, *July 9*, 524.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
  Bodmin Parliamentary Election—New Writ, Motion for, *July 5*, 253.
  Ceylon Pearl Fisheries, Conditions of leasing, *July 5*, 217.
  Great Yarmouth Parliamentary Election Petition—Proceedings at Trial, Allegations against Mr. Justice Grantham, *July 6*, 369–376, 413, 414.
    Political Bias and Partisanship, Charges of, *July 6*, 372–376.
  Street Traffic Commission Report, Cost of Publishing, etc., *July 9*, 528.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
  Dipton Catholic School Inquiry, Result of, *July 4*, 36.
  Egypt
    British Officers, Attack on—Procedure in Trial, Sentences inflicted, etc., *July 12*, 1054–1057.
    Unrest in—Prosecutions of Europeans during last Five Years, *July 12*, 1054.
  Great Northern Railway—Lack of Third-class Carriages and Sanitary Accommodation, alleged, *July 13*, 1187.
  Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 649.
  Local Government Board Audit of Local Authorities Accounts, Date of and Fees for, etc., *July 16*, 1317.

Macedonia
Budget Deficit, Proposals for meeting out of increased Turkish Customs Dues.
Os. Sir E. Grey, *July 5*, 324, 325.
Q. Mr. Gooch ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 9*, 510, 511.
Q. Mr. L. Jones ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 9*, 511.

Gendarmerie Demands, Attitude of the Porte towards.
Q. Mr. L. Jones ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 9*, 511.

Macroom
Allotments Scheme for Labourers' Cottages, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Sheehan ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 11*, 857, 858.

Maddison, Mr. F. [Burnley]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1407, 1048, 1410, 1412–1425.

Maghery Bay
Boat-slip—Reply to Memorial.
Q. Mr. H. Law ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 499.

Magistrates, Ireland
Appointments during last Twelve Months, Return as to, proposed.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 12*, 1016 ; Lord Denman, 1018, 1021 ; Earl of Mayo, 1021 ; Earl of Crewe, 1024.

Disloyal Speeches by, Inciting to Illegal and Criminal Acts—Attitude of H.M. Government.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 12*, 1008–1011, 1026 ; Lord Denman, 1017–1019 ; Lord Ashbourne, 1022 ; Earl of Crewe, 1023, 1024 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 1025.

Fees on Appointment.
Q. Mr. S. Young ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 732.

Procedure as to Appointment of.
Os. Lord Muskerry, *July 12*, 1008, 1009, 1026 ; Lord Denman, 1020 ; Lord Ashbourne, 1021, 1022, 1026 ; Earl of Crewe, 1023 ; Marquess of Londonderry, 1025.

Magnus, Sir P. [London University]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 597 ; *July 11*, 933–935 ; *July 16*, 1410.

Indian Public Works Department, Place of Education of Candidates appointed to, *July 12*, 1048.

Malay States
Opium Farming System, Alteration in, proposed.
Qs. Mr. A. Allen ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1326, 1327.

Mall to Charing Cross
Spring Gardens Entrance, Proposals as to, Date of Completion, etc.
Q. Mr. T. Davies ; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *July 4*, 37, 38.

Malta
Garrison in, Reduction of, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1105.

Protestant Mission Services, Discontinuance of—Tabling Correspondence, proposed.
Qs. Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Belloc, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 5*, 218–220.
Qs. Mr. T. L. Corbett ; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1331.

Manchester
Jaffe & Co., Messrs., Reason for Police Raid of Premises of.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 13*, 1186.

Manchester Churches Bill
c. 3R.* *July 6*, 351.
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 9*, 426.

Manchester Corporation Bill
l. 3R.* *July 9*, 425.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 16*, 1297.

Manchuria
Dalny—Alleged Closing to other than Japanese Goods.
Q. Mr. Straus ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 9*, 510.

Marks, Mr. H. H. [Kent, Thanet]
China—Punitive Methods prevailing in British Concessions, Allegations as to Flogging and Use of the "Cangue," *July 5*, 253–258.

Marlborough Street Police Court
Cab-driver Simmons, Fine Imposed on.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 9*, 517.

Married Women's Property Bill
l. *Com.* *July 5*, 163.
*Rep.** *July 6*, 350.
3R.* *July 16*, 1276.

Amendments made by Select Committee.
Os. Lord Davey, *July 5*, 163.

Martyn Estate
Cooks Town Farm, Disposal of.
Q. Mr. Duffy ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 730.

Mason, Mr. J. F. [Windsor]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 11*, 948, 949, 952.

State-aided School Grants, Administration, etc., of, *July 9*, 525.

State-aided Schools, Control of, *July 11*, 881.

Teachers—Tenure of Office, Conditions of, *July 9*, 525.

Massereene, Visc.

Sat First in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *July 10*, 653.

Massie, Dr. J. [Wilts., Cricklade]

Education—State-aided Schools, Number of Children attending, *July 10*, 707, 709, 711.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 16*, 1411–1414, 1421.

Masterman, Mr. C. F. G. [West Ham, N.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 16*, 1379, 1380, 1399.

Mayo

Marine Works—Proposals as to carrying out Schemes.
Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 486.

Mayo, Earl of

Magistrates, Ireland—Appointments during last twelve months—Return as to, proposed, *July 12*, 1021.

Meagher, Mr. M. [Kilkenny, N.]

Holdenstown—Reinstatement Claims of Mrs. Sexton's Representatives, *July 9*, 484.

Kilkenny—Reinstatement Claims, etc., *July 9*, 485.

Waring Estate—Reinstatement Claim of S. Caldbeck, *July 9*, 485.

Menzies, Mr. W. [Lanark, S.]

Ceylon Pearl Fisheries, Conditions of Leasing, *July 4*, 28.

Street Traffic Commission Report, Cost of Publishing, etc., *July 9*, 527, 528.

Merchant Shipping

[*For* particular Vessels, *see their names*.]

British Seamen

Conditions of Service.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 5*, 172.

Decrease in Number of.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 5*, 165; Earl of Granard, 168.

Merchant Shipping—*cont.*

British Seamen—*cont.*

Supply and Training of

Departmental Committee of Inquiry, proposed Appointment of.
Os. Earl of Granard, *July 5*, 170–172; Lord Muskerry, 170, 171; Marquess of Salisbury, 171, 172.

State-aided Training Ships, Establishment of.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 5*, 164–168; Earl of Granard, 168–170.

Desertion—Allocation of Forfeited Wages, etc.
Q. Mr. L. Haslam; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 5*, 234, 235.

Foreign Seamen, Increase in Number of.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 5*, 163, 164.

Lascar Seamen, Increase in Number of.
Os. Lord Brassey, *July 5*, 164; Earl of Granard, 168.

Rebates, Proposals as to Inquiry into.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 16*, 1343.

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill

Date of sending to the Lords, Allowing Adequate time for Discussion, etc.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 5*, 172; Marquess of Lansdowne, 177; Marquess of Ripon, 181.

Report Stage, Date of Taking.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 5*, 235.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 10*, 739.

Metropolitan District Railway

See under Railways—Electric.

Metropolitan Electric Supply Bill

c. 2R.* *July 16*, 1297.

Metropolitan Railway Bill

c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* * *July 4*, 350.

Metropolitan Water Board Bill

l. 3R.* *July 9*, 425.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* * *July 13*, 1181.

Micklem, Mr. N. [Herts, Watford]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 4*, 123.

Middlemore, Mr. J. T. [Birmingham, N.]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 9*, 545, 553, 554; *July 10*, 808.

Shropshire, Worcestershire, and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill, 2R., *July 10*, 852.

Midland Railway Bill

l. 3R.* *July 5*, 158.
c. Lords Amendts., *Con., July 10*, 701.

Militia
- Enlistment into the Regular Army through, Proposals for dealing with.
  - *Os.* Mr. Arnold-Forster, *July 12*, 1126.
- First line of Drafts for Regular Army, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1111, 1112.
- Foreign Service for, Proposals as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1111, 1113; Sir C. Dilke, 1134.
- Garrison Artillery
  - Training Scheme for.
    - *Os.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1094.
  - Utilising Services of, for Ammunition Columns of Regular Artillery, proposed.
    - *Os.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1090, 1091; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 1122, 1123; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1160.
    - *Q.* Col. Walker; *A.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 16*, 1322.
- Reorganisation proposals.
  - *Os.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1111–1113; Sir C. Dilke, 1134.
- Territorial Army, Converting into, proposed.
  - *Os.* Lord Grimthorpe, *July 10*, 694, 695.
- Utilisation of, in certain Branches of Regular Army Work, Proposals as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1083, 1084; Viscount Castlereagh, 1144.
- Winter Training Scheme, Battalions selected for.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 9*, 504.

Milk Trade
- Milk drawn within three Days after Calving, Restrictions on Sale of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 10*, 725.

Mill of Mey
- Letter Delivery Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. R. L. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 4*, 9.

Milner, Viscount
- Compulsory Military Service
  - German System, *July 10*, 686, 687.
  - Proposals as to—Cost of the Scheme, etc., *July 10*, 682–689.

Mitchell-Thompson, Mr. W. [Lanark, N.W.]
- Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry [Scotland] Bill—Committing to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 4*, 61, 64.

Monastic and Conventual Institutions
- Private Burying Grounds, Conditions of Permission to Use.
  - *Qs.* Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 5*, 230, 231.

Money Orders
- *See under* Post Office.

Monkswell, Lord
- London County Council
  - Financial Committee of, Recommendations of Ignored, alleged, *July 9*, 455.
  - Financial Methods of—*Status* of Credit, etc., *July 9*, 455.
  - Housing Schemes, Buildings, etc.—Excess of Expenditure over Estimate, etc., *July 9*, 456.
  - Steamboat Service, Excess of Expenditure over Estimate and Receipt, *July 9*, 455.
- London County Council [Money] Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 454–456.
- London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 1243–1250, 1258, 1259.
- Russia, Visit of British Fleet during Manœuvres, Abandonment of Proposal, *July 16*, 1274.

Montagu of Beaulieu, Lord
- London County Council
  - Traffic Board, Establishment of proposed, *July 9*, 450, 451.
  - Tramway Services, Motor Omnibus Competition, *July 9*, 450.
- London County Council (Money) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 450–451.

Montgomery
- Vaccination Exemption Case of Mr. W. C. Palmer, *July 10*, 710.

Morgan, Mr. J. L. [Carmarthen, W.]
- Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1455–1457.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary of State for India* [Montrose Burghs.]
- Army—Case of H. J. Penson, *July 5*, 225.
- Assam—Udoy Patni, Circumstances of Execution of, *July 4*, 12; *July 12*, 1046.
- Bengal—Boycott of British Goods, alleged, *July 9*, 508.
- Bengal, Eastern
  - Condition of, etc., *July 4*, 12.
  - Legislative Council—Representation of Planting Interest, *July 5*, 222.
  - Partition of—Local Opinion, etc., *July 5*, 223.

[*cont.*

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Bengal, Eastern—*cont.*
Processions, etc., Restrictions on, *July 5*, 221.
Swadeshi Movement, alleged Repressive Measures against, *July 5*, 221.
Budget, Opportunity for discussing Vice-regal Council, Time allotted to, *July 9*, 510.
Calcutta Madrasseh—Present Position of Dr. E. D. Ross and Qualifications of Mr. J. A. Chapman for Principalship, *July 4*, 23.
Education
Appointment and Qualifications of Messrs. E. Candler and W. Horne, *July 4*, 10.
Indian Languages Examinations, Tabling Regulations for, proposed, *July 5*, 222.
Guzerat and the Deccan—Rainfall and Monsoon Forecast, *July 10*, 711.
Judicial and Executive Functions, Separation of, proposed, *July 4*, 11.
Moral and Material Progress—Discontinuance of Annual Statement proposed, *July 9*, 509.
Natives, Outrages by—Sentences on Assailant of Mr. Earle and murderer of Mr. Goss, *July 9*, 509.
Public Works Department, Place of Education of Candidates appointed to, *July 12*, 1048.
Textile Mills, Conditions of Labour in, *July 4*, 11.
Tibet—Dr. S. Hedin, Reason for Refusal of Permission to Enter Tibet, *July 5*, 223, 224.
Vizamgan-Malia Railway Line, Reconnaissance of Routes for, *July 5*, 202.
Waste Land, Rules for Reclamation of, *July 4*, 22.

Morocco
Slavery, Proposals for Prohibition of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *July 10*, 718, 719.

Morpeth, Lord [Birmingham, S.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 748, 801; *July 11*, 902–904, 939.

Morrell, Mr. P. [Oxon, Henley]
Taxation, Local, Legislative proposals as to, *July 16*, 1304.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland]
Hammersmith, City, and North East London Railway Bill—Suspension of Proceedings on until next Session, *July 4*, 4.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1459.

Motors
Accidents
Number caused by, in London Area.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 10*, 721.
Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 1313.
Prevention of,—Date of Presenting Report, etc.
Qs. Mr. G. H. Faber, Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 9*, 521, 522.
Agricultural Crops, Damage done to.
Os. Mr. Rees, *July 13*, 1234.
Commission—Date of Presenting Report.
Os. Earl of Powis, Earl of Granard, *July 10*, 701.
Dust Nuisance, Proposals for dealing with.
Q. Col. Warde; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 4*, 21.
Handcross Hill, *see that title.*
Omnibuses
Regulation and Inspection, Proposals as to.
Qs. Sir E. Sassoon, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July*, *16*, 1339, 1340.
Testing, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Channing; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 16*, 1315.
Speed Regulation, Applications received from Local Authorities.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 12*, 1062.
Traction Engines
Modifications of Rules as to use of highways, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. Hope; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 4*, 10.
Traffic in European Capitals, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 11*, 878.

Mullycastle
Reinstatement Claim of Mr. M'Evoy.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1043.

Municipal Corporations Bill
c. Lords' Amendt., *Con.* July 12*, 1074.

Muntz, Sir P. A. [Warwickshire, Tamworth]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 971; *July 16*, 1409, 1410.

Musical Copyright Bill
c. *Com.*, *July 4*, 155; *July 9*, 651; *July 16*, 1452.
Rep. July 16*, 1488.
Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. A. J. Balfour; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 5*, 249. 250.

Muskerry, Lord
- Ireland
  - Ancient Order of Hibernians, Seditious Actions of, Connection with United Irish League, *July 12*, 1012–1014.
  - Magistrates
    - Appointments during last Twelve Months—Return as to, proposed, *July 12*, 1016.
    - Disloyal Speeches by, Inciting to Illegal and Criminal Acts—Attitude of His Majesty's Government, *July 12*, 1008–1011, 1026.
    - Procedure as to Appointment of, *July 12*, 1008, 1009, 1026.
  - Sinn-Fein, policy of, *July 12*, 1014, 1015
- Merchant Shipping — British Seamen, Supply and Training of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, *July 5*, 170, 171.

Myer, Mr. H. [Lambeth, N.]
- Patent Medicines, Restrictions on Sale of, proposed, *July 12*, 1059.

Napier, Mr. T. B. [Kent, Faversham]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 10*, 802.

Natal
- Bill of Indemnity, Provisions of.
  Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1326.
- Native Rising
  - Bambaata, Alleged Decapitation of Corpse of.
    Qs. Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. Dalziel; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 1360.
  - Casualties among White and Black Forces.
    Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 5*, 214, 215.
    Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1052.
  - Native Prisoners, Treatment of.
    Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Speaker, Mr. Churchill, *July 11*, 872.
  - White Man Murdered in Mesini's Kraal, Discovery of.
    Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 9*, 508.
  - Zulu Wounded, Treatment of.
    Q. Mr. Lehmann; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 1360.

National British Art Gallery, Millbank
- Keeper of, Special Qualifications required for Duties of—Treasury Minute Presented, *July 4*, 7; *July 5*, 161.

National Physical Laboratory
- Work undertaken by, Alleged Competition with private Firms, etc.
  Qs. Sir B. Stone; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 13*, 1184, 1185.

Navy
- *First Lord*—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
- *Financial Secretary* — Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.
- "Africa" Trials, Alleged Narrow Escape from running on Rocks during.
  Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 9*, 481.
- "Britannia" Cadets—Instruction in handling open Sailing Boats, etc., proposed.
  Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 4*, 8.
- Civil Employment of ex-sailors
  - Report of Committee, with Minutes of Evidence Presented, *July 9*, 480, *July 10*, 655.
- Dockyards, Maximum and Minimum Number employed in, since 1900.
  Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 9*, 495.
- Education and Training, New Scheme for —Report by Italian Minister of Marine.
  Q. Mr. T. H. Davies; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 9*, 500.
- Expenditure of Principal Maritime Powers—Return as to Expenditure during last Ten Years, proposed.
  Q. Mr. Thomasson; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 4*, 8, 9.
- Manœuvres
  - Baltic Cruise, Abandonment of.
    Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 1333.
  - Merchant Vessels taking Part in.
    Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 9*, 482, 483.
    Q. Mr. Beauchamp; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 11*, 865.
  - Result of, etc.
    Qs. Mr. Bellairs, Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 12*, 1044, 1045.
  - Russian Ports, Projected Visit to, *see* Russia—British Fleet, Visit of.
- "Montagu," Prospects of Floating, etc.
  Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 4*, 21, 22,
- Savings Banks—Accounts Presented, *July 10*, 655, 704.
- Shipbuilding Statistics (1900–1906).
  Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 12*, 1031, 1032.

Navy Estimates

Educational Services—£165,600, *Rep. July 13*, 1237.

Martial Law, Including Naval Prisons at Home and Abroad—14,700, *Rep. July 13*, 1236.

Medical Services at Home and Abroad—£275,000, *Rep.* July 13*, 1236.

Miscellaneous Effective Services—£482,200, *Rep.* July 13*, 1237.

Reserves—£426,600, *Rep.* July 13*, 1237.

Scientific Services—£65,100, *Rep.* July 13*, 1237.

Victualling and Clothing—£2,053,200, *Rep.* July 13*, 1236.

Nettlebed and District Commons (Preservation) Bill

c. 2R.* *July 16*, 1443.

New Hebrides

Decision as to—Action of the Foreign Office.

Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 5*, 280.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Electric Supply Bill

c. Rep. July 12*, 1028.

Newport Corporation Bill

c. Con. July 10*, 702.

3R.* *July 13*, 1182.

Newport Harbour Commissioners Bill

l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 3*, 158.

Newton, Lord

Autumn Session, Course of Business during, *July 5*, 184.

Bills in House of Lords, Inadequate Time for Discussion under present System, etc., *July 5*, 183-185.

Business of the House—King's Speech, Measures promised in, Information as to, Date of bringing to the House of Lords, etc., *July 5*, 183.

Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill, 3R. *July 16*, 1272.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, Date of Introduction in the House of Lords—Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 184.

Newtownards Urban District Council Bill

c. 3R.* *July 6*, 351.

l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 12*, 994.

Nield, Mr. H. [Middlesex, Ealing]

Africa, South—Customs Duty on Skimmed Condensed Milk, *July 9*, 490.

Metropolitan District Trains, Reason for shortening, *July 5*, 204.

Nigeria

Chief Nana, Decision as to Return of.

Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1328.

Railway Extension, Decision as to.

Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1050.

Norfolk, Earldom of

Claim of Lord Mowbray before the Committee for Private Privileges, *July 5*, 157; *July 6*, 333; *July 9*, 425; *July 12*, 993.

North Camas

Reinstatement Claims of C. Walsh and J. Toomey.

Q. Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 48, 49.

North-East London Railway Bill

l. 3R.* *July 9*, 425.

c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 13*, 1181.

North-West London Railway Bill

l. Report from Select Committee, *July 10*, 654.

Northumberland

Sea Fisheries District—Order relating to, Presented, *July 16*, 1275, 1299.

Northumberland, Duke of

London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 3R, *July 16*, 1266-1268.

Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Tramways Bill

l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.* July 5*, 158.

O'Brien, Mr. K. E. [Tipperary, Mid.]

Manchester—Reason for Police Raid on Premises of Messrs. Jaffe & Co., *July 13*, 1186.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]

Kilkenny—Officers' Quarters and Mess, Allocation of Contracts for furnishing, *July 9*, 488.

O'Connor, Mr. Jas. [Wicklow, W.]

Carlisle Post Office—Duties of Telegraph Boys, *July 6*, 354.

Glasgow Postmen, Revision of Allowances to, *July 5*, 237.

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 16*, 1355.

Milk drawn within Three Days after Calving, Restrictions on Sale of, proposed, *July 10*, 725.

Motor Accidents in London Area during June, *July 10*, 721.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 533.

[*cont.*

O'Connor, Mr. Jas.—*cont.*
Tinahely Post Office Medical Officer—Appointment of Dr. J. Bolster, *July 16*, 1356, 1357.
Wade, District Constabulary Inspector, Allowance to, for Man Servant, *July 16*, 1349.
Wicklow Magistracy, Religion of, *July 5*, 243.

O'Connor, Mr. John [Kildare, N.]
Deaths — Remuneration for furnishing Annual Lists for Parliamentary Registration Purposes, *July 5*, 206.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 155; *July 9*, 651, 652; *July 16*, 1465, 1466, 1469, 1483.
Proposals as to, *July 5*, 249.

O'Doherty, Mr. P. [Donegal, N.]
Fisheries—Decision as to Restrictions on Use of Drift Nets, etc., *July 5*, 209.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
Administrative Boards in Ireland, Return as to, proposed, *July 10*, 705.
Education
General Return (1904–5), Date of Presenting, *July 4*, 20.
Intermediate Board
Parliamentary Control over, etc., *July 10*, 738.
Rules etc., Minutes and Correspondence, Decision as to, Tabling, *July 5*, 203.
Postmasters, Sub-, Classification, etc., *July 6*, 355.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]
Bramley Union—Inquiry into Case of C. Endsor, proposed, *July 16*, 1342.

O'Hare, Mr. P. [Monaghan, N.]
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1461, 1479, 1480, 1483, 1486.

O'Kelly, Mr. C. [Mayo, N]
Mayo Marine Works Schemes, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 486.
Perry-Knox Gore—Purchase Proposals for Crannagh Farm, *July 5*, 247; *July 9*, 486.

O'Malley, Mr. W. [Galway, Connemara]
Ballinakill Oyster Beds—Licence Applications of Miss Deane and Mrs. Browne, *July 16*, 1318.
Clifden Bridewell, Cost of, Number of Persons detained in, etc., *July 16*, 1319.
Tullycross Police Barracks, Discontinuance of, proposed, *July 16*, 1319.

O'Mara, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, S.]
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Acts proposed to be included in, *July 4*, 58.
Kilkeary Land Commission Holdings—Rent Agreement of Tenants, etc., *July 4*, 45.
Tyndall Estate—Rent Recovery Proceedings, etc., *July 4*, 42.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W]
Athea Rural Postman, Wages of, *July 6*, 355.
Borrisokane Union—Conditions of Appointment of Mr. Haire, *July 16*, 1353.
Carriekerry Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 11*, 895.
Delmege Estate, Purchase of, and Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, *July 11*, 893, 894.
Douglas Estate—Reinstatement of Mrs. K. Scanlan, *July 11*, 894.
Land Commission
Post Cards, Official, Alleged Use of, by ex-Sub-Commissioner, *July 11*, 892, 893.
Temporary Assistant Commissioners, Land Valuations by, on Expiration of Term of Office, *July 11*, 890, 891.
Limerick
Evicted Tenants, Inquiry into Cases of, *July 4*, 55.
Fair Rent Appeals, Decision of Court as to, *July 4*, 55.
Sheehy, Major, Estate of—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Scanlan, *July 4*, 54.
Tralee Telephone Extension Proposals, *July 4*, 19.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W]
Dungarvan—Decision as to Cunnigar Causeway, *July 6*, 1320.
Poor Law Commission, Irish Medical Representation on, *July 16*, 1321.

Oldham and Saddleworth District Tramways (Abandonment) Bill
*c. Con** and 3R.* *July 6*, 351.
l. 1R.* *July 6*, 334.
Bill not to be proceeded with, *July 13*, 1173.

Omnibus and Tram Ticket Prizes
Legality of, Accidents resulting to Children, etc.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 9*, 514.

Onslow, Earl of
  Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 1271, 1274.
  London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 1255, 1268, 1269.

Opium Trade
  Prohibition of, in English Possessions, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1327.

Ordnance Survey
  Ireland—Place of Printing Maps.
    Q. Captain Donelan; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *July 16*, 1346, 1347.
  Progress, Report on, Presented, *July 10*, 704.

Pacific Cable Act, 1901
  Accounts Presented, *July 11*, 855; *July 12*, 996.

Paisley Gas and Water Provisional Order Bill
  c. 1R.* *July 10*, 702.

Parker, Mr. J. [Halifax]
  Army Pensions — Non - Commissioned Officers and Soldiers retired during Last Seven Years, *July 10*, 714.
  Tin and Black-Plate Industry—Revision of Inspection System proposed, *July 10*, 723.
  Truck Commission, Progress made by, etc., *July 10*, 723.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
  Africa, South—Self-Government Proposals —Date of granting Letters Patent, *July 16*, 1358.
  Africa, West—Allegations as to Slavery in Portuguese Islands of St. Thomé and Principé, *July 5*, 229.
  Bengal, Eastern—Regulations as to Prohibition of Annoyance by shouting "Bande Mataram, *July 16*, 1323.
  Congo Free State, Belgian Administration of—Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives, etc., *July 5*, 258-266.
    Consular Courts, Right of Great Britain to establish, *July 5*, 261, 265.
    Origin of—Declaration of International Association of the Congo, *July 5*, 259.
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1380–1382.
  Transvaal—Native Labour
    Crimes, Statistics as to, *July 9*, 507.
    Return, proposed, *July 12*, 1049.
    Wages in certain Years, *July 12*, 1050.

Parliament
  House of Commons
    Kitchen Committee—Laundries employed by.
      Q. Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Jacoby, *July 10*, 726, 727.
    Lighting and Ventilating Department Employees, Pension Claims of.
      Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Mc Kenna, *July 5*, 202.
    Ventilation Report—Appendix Presented, *July 12*, 995, 1030.
  House of Lords
    Representative Peers for Ireland—Graves', Lord, Claims to vote, *July 5*, 157.
    Sat first
      Inverclyde, Lord, after the Death of his Brother, *July 12*, 993.
      Massereene, Viscount, after the Death of his Father, *July 10*, 653.
      Romney, Earl of, after the Death of his Father, *July 5*, 157.
    Took the Oath
      Connaught and Strathearn, H.R.H. Duke of, *July 13*, 1173.
      Kenlis, Lord, *July 5*, 425.
      Lonsdale, Earl of, *July 13*, 1173.

Parliamentary Elections
  New Writs
    Tyrone, East—*Motion* for Issue (Colonel Saunderson).
      Os. Colonel Saunderson, *July 6*, 359–362, 369; Mr. Paul, 360; Mr. J. Redmond, 362–364; Mr. Dodd, 364–367; Mr. C. Craig, 367, 368; Captain Craig, 368.
  Petitions—Bodmin and Great Yarmouth, *see those titles.*

Parliamentary Procedure
  Autumn Session, Proposals as to.
    Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 5*, 175, 176, 197; Lord Heneage, 191; Marquess of Salisbury, 191–194; Earl of Crewe, 194–197; Marquess of Lansdowne, 176, 179; Marquess of Ripon, 182, 197; Lord Newton, 184; Viscount Goschen, 188, 189; Earl of Camperdown, 189, 190; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 1191.
  Chairman's Rulings, *see* Chairman.
  Speaker's Rulings, *see* Speaker.
  Speeches, Duration of, Proposals for dealing with.
    Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 1359.

Patent Agents
Number registered, Names erased, etc.
Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 11*, 860.

Patent Medicines
Restrictions on Sale of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Myer; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 12*, 1059, 1060.

Paul, Mr. H. W. [Northampton]
Army Promotions—Enforcement of Order against use of outside influence, *July 10*, 712.
Ecclesiastical Discipline Commission Report.
"Houses of Laymen," Legal *status* of, *July 5*, 232.
Recommendation as to Meeting of two Convocations, *July 12*, 1073.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 9*, 634; *July 10*, 749, 829, 830, 971; *July 16*, 1429.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour — Repatriation, "Tremblingly obey," Use of Term in Notification, *July 4*, 24.
Native Labour—Rate of Wages, *July 9*, 506.
Tyrone, East—New Writ, Motion for Issue of, *July 6*, 360.

Pearce, Mr. R. [Staffordshire, Leek]
Education (England & Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 144; *July 9*, 562, 596; *July 10*, 779.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
Education (England & Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 805.
Pilchards—Italian Government Reply to Representations, etc., *July 11*, 859.

Penllwyn Railway and Road Bill
c. 3R.* *July 6*, 351.
l. Commons' Amendts., *July 9*, 426.

Percy, Earl [Kensington, S.]
Congo Free State, Belgian Administration of—Charges of Ill-Treatment of Natives, etc., *July 5*, 294–298.
Egypt—British Officers, Attack on—Execution and Flogging of Natives, Allegations as to Method of Carrying out, etc., *July 5*, 289, 290.
Foreign Office, Policy of, *July 5*, 290, 291.
Russia—Anti-Semitic Disturbances in, Intervention by Great Britain, proposed, *July 5*, 291, 292.
Tibet, Reason for Refusal of Permission to Dr. S. Hedin to enter, *July 5*, 223, 224.

Percy, Earl—*cont.*
Turkey
Customs Duties, proposed Increase in
British Trade, Effect on, *July 5*, 293.
Conditions Imposed by Great Britain, *July 5*, 292, 293.
Financial Conditions of, Possibility of Effecting Reform in, *July 5*, 293, 294.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]
Education (England & Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 84, 85, 91, 127, 128; *July 9*, 561, 564, 589, 590, 618; *July 10*, 787, 788.

Perry-Knox-Gore Estate
Crannagh Farm, Purchase Proposals for.
Qs. Mr. C. O'Kelly; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 247, 248; *July 9*, 486, 487.

Persian Gulf
Railway Concession to Kermanshah, German Application for.
Q. Sir W. Evans-Gordon; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 9*, 511, 512.

Peterborough Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *July 9*, 425.
c. Lords' Amendts. *Con.* *July 13*, 1181.

Pickersgill, Mr. E. H. [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
Africa, East—Labour Recruiting Licences, Issue of, *July 16*, 1330.
Burials Act, 1855, Amendment of—Decision in Godden Case, etc., *July 16*, 1343.
Education Board Vote, Date of Taking, *July 11*, 896.
Egypt
British Officers, Attack on—Sentence Inflicted, etc., *July 5*, 226, 227.
Law of Trespass, Decision as to Amendment of, *July 5*, 228.
Truck Act Committee, Bringing Case of Dean *v.* Wilson to Notice of, proposed, *July 16*, 1339.

Piccadilly
Traffic Regulations as to Loitering Cabs—Case of J. Scott.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 13*, 1186.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill
l. 2R.* *July 9*, 426.
Com. *July 10*, 654.
3R.* *July 12*, 994.

Piers and Harbours
[*For* particular Places, *see their names.*]

Pilchards
Italian Government Reply to Representations, etc.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 11*, 859.

Plural Voting Bill
Date of Introduction in the House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion, etc.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 5*, 177, 178; Marquess of Ripon, 182.

Police
Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*

Metropolitan

Hitchcock, Mrs. H., Case of.
Q. Mr. Radford; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 9*, 514.

Intoxication, Charge of, against Constables—Regulation as to Claiming Medical Opinion.
Q. Mr. Rowlands; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 1334.

Race Meetings, Employment at.
Qs. Dr. Cooper; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 10*, 720, 721.

Sunday Duty and Annual Holiday of.
Q. Mr. T. H. Davies; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 5*, 230.

Vote for, *July 13*, 1240.

Weekly Day of Rest, proposed.
Q. Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 1337.

Polling Districts

See also Names of Places.

Orders Altering, Presented, *July 16*, 1276.

Pontardawe

Medical Officer of Health—Appointment of Dr. G. Griffiths.
Q. Mr. J. Williams; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 16*, 1341.

Poor Law

Commission—Irish Medical Representation on.
Qs. Mr. O'Shee, Captain Craig; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 1321.

Filial Liability to Contribute to Maintenance of Parents—Amendment of Law proposed.
Q. Mr. Essex; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 5*, 236.

Ireland—Commission Report, Date of Presenting.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 10*, 735.

Poplar
Poor Law

Inquiry—Notes, etc., Publication of, proposed.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 4*, 34, 35.

Schools and Receiving House for Children, Cost of.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 4*, 35.

Portland, Duke of
Horse-breeding—Carrying out Recommendations of Royal Commission, proposed, *July 16*, 1283–1287.

Portsmouth, Earl of—*Under Secretary for War.*

Barracks

Lichfield, Accommodation for Married Soldiers, Inadequacy of, *July 9*, 476, 477, 478.

Tidworth Barracks, Hospital, Church, and Recreation Room Accommodation, Proposals as to, *July 6*, 337, 338, 339.

Compulsory Military Service

German System, *July 10*, 679, 680.

Proposals as to—Cost of the Scheme, etc., *July 10*, 676–682, 689.

Defence of the Empire

Expansion outside Limit of Regular Forces, Necessity for, *July 10*, 673, 674, 681.

Unpreparedness of the Nation for War, alleged, *July 10*, 672–675.

Mobilisation of Army in Event of War, Arrangements for, *July 9*, 474, 475.

Experiment Mobilisation of one Command to Test Arrangements, proposed, *July 9*, 474.

Reserve Officers called up for Service during South African War—Inquiry into Grievances of, proposed, *July 9*, 472, 473.

Three Years' Service Experiment, Failure of, *July 10*, 674.

Portsmouth Water Bill
c. *Rep.* July 12*, 1029.

Post Office
Postmaster General—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.

[*For* particular Places *see their names.*]

Contracts, Work of Inspector of.
Q. Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 12*, 1071.

Mail Service

American—Payment to German Vessels for Carriage of British Mails.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 4*, 33.

[*cont.*

Post Office—*cont.*
Mail Service—*cont.*
Australian, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 9*, 505.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 12*, 1033.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 12*, 1062, 1063.
Canadian—Sending by Allan Line, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 11*, 879.
Money Orders
Inland Amendment (No. 1) Regulations, 1906, Presented, *July 5*, 161.
Paying at House of Addressee, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 5*, 201.
Parcel Post—Foreign and Colonial Amendment (No 19), Warrant Presented, *July 16*, 1300.
Postage Rates on Fifteen Gram Letters, Regulations as to.
Q. Mr. Beaumont; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 12*, 1039.
Postmaster, sub, Classification of and Retiring Allowances to.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 6*, 355.
Volunteer Forces, Regulations as to Employees joining.
Q. Mr. J. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 10*, 705.
Vote for, *July 13*, 1238.

Post Office Savings Bank
Deficiencies—Vote for, *July 13*, 1237.
Deposit of Sixpence, Regulation as to.
Q. Mr. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 5*, 201, 202.
Unclaimed Balances, procedure in Transferring to Dormant Ledgers—Preparation of Index, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 16*, 1310, 1311.

Post Office Sites (Re-committed) Bill
c. Com., *July 16*, 1447.

Postmaster-General
Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.

Potted Meats
See Canned Foodstuffs.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 121; *July 9*, 565, 566, 630; *July 10*, 766, 769; *July 11*, 909–911, 948; *July 16*, 1361–1363, 1372, 1373.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Beresford Estate, Sale Negotiations for, *July 12*, 1069.
Fishery Grounds, Vessels employed in Protecting, *July 10*, 728.

Powis, Earl of
Motor Cars Commission—Date of Presenting Report, *July 10*, 701.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Right Hon. Earl Carrington.

President of the Board of Education
Right Hon. A. Birrell.

President of the Board of Trade
Right Hon. D. Lloyd-George.

President of the Local Government Board
Right Hon. J. Burns.

Press
Dissemination of News by, in time of War—Government Control over, etc.—Introduction of Bill, proposed.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *July 13*, 1174 – 1179; Lord Tweedmouth, 1179, 1180; Earl Cawdor, 1180, 1181.

Price, Mr. C. E. [Edinburgh, Central]
Army Emergency Rations, Reason for Destroying, *July 4*, 13.

Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899
Panel of Lords appointed, *July 9*, 470.

Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 11*, 900.

Questions
Asking of Question ruled as Inadmissible, *July 11*, 872.
Charges against Members in, *July 11*, 887.
Comment on Previous Answers not in Order, *July 11*, 889, 890.
Irrelevant, *July 5*, 234.
Late Government, Questions asked of Ministers of, not Permissible, *July 5*, 217.
Matter of Opinion, Question on, not Permissible, *July 4*, 26.
Notice to be given of, *July 9*, 533.
Quotation Marks, Reason for Omission of, by Printers.
Os. Mr. Healy, Mr. Speaker, *July 4*, 25.

[*cont.*

Questions—*cont.*
Reply by Under-Secretary for the Colonies, Provocative Wording of.
Qs. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Speaker, *July 5*, 220.
Speeches may not be made during time for, *July 4*, 25; *July 5*, 217.

Radford, Mr. G. H. [Islington, E.]
Police—Case of Mrs. H. Hitchcock, *July 9*, 514.

Railway Clearing System (Superannuation Fund) Bill
l. Commons' Amendts., *Con.** *July 5*, 158.

Railways
Agricultural Produce, Rates for.
Qs. Mr. Gardner, *July 13*, 1224; Mr. G. Faber, 1227; Mr. Cairns, 1235.
Report and Recommendations of Departmental Committee.
Qs. Mr. Soares, *July 13*, 1212–1216, 1219, 1220; Lord Turnour, 1214, 1216–1219; Sir F. Banbury, 1214, 1219–1222. Sir E. Strachey, 1228; Mr. H. Beach, 1232, 1233.
Banking Trains up Inclines by Uncoupled Engines, Danger of Practice of.
Q. Mr. Wardle; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 5*, 235, 236.
Electric Metropolitan District Trains, Length of.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 5*, 204, 205.
Ireland
Clearing House Returns, Information contained in, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 16*, 1315.
Great Northern Railway—Lack of Sanitary Accommodation and Non-provision of Third Class Carriages, alleged.
Q. Mr. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 13*, 1187, 1188.
Great Southern and Western Railway Rates on Agricultural Exhibits.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 497.
Inquiry, Proposals as to, and Scope of.
Qs. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 207, 208.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 16*, 1316.
Qs. Mr. H. Law; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1356.
Light—Orders Presented, *July 5*, 335, 353, 354.

Railways—*cont.*
London and South Western Company—Penalties on Engine Drivers for Failure to keep Scheduled Time.
Qs. Mr. Wardle; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Speaker, *July 5*, 233, 234.
Rates, etc., Complaints as to—Alteration of Present System proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 9*, 492.
Statistics as to.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 9*, 518.

Rasch, Major Sir F. C. [Chelmsford]
Army
Estimates, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 530.
Guards, Reduction in Strength of, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1155.
Lancers, 9th (Queen's Royal) South African Service of, *July 5*, 210.
Personnel, Reductions, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1155.
Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1155.
Egypt—Cavalry Barrack Accommodation at Cairo, *July 5*, 210.
Speeches, Duration of—Proposals for dealing with Question, *July 16*, 1359.
Swine Fever, Method of inducing, *July 13*, 1234.
Transvaal
Chinese Labourers—Statistics as to, *July 5*, 212.
White Labour employed in Mines, *July 9*, 505.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P. [Cambridge University]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 89–91, 119, 121–123; *July 9*, 589; *July 10*, 816, 817.

Recorders, Stipendiary Magistrates and Clerks of the Peace Bill
c. 1R.* *July 4*, 60.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
Ballynanty—Case of Mrs. Hartigan, *July 5*, 245.
Belfast—Speech delivered by Rev. R. D. Patterson, *July 9*, 531.
Business of the House, Course of, *July 11*, 898.
Canals, Royal Commission, Irish Representation on, *July 9*, 534.
Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 650, 651.
Labourers, Ireland, Advances—Resolution, *July 11*, 989; *July 16*, 1445.

[*cont.*

Redmond, Mr. J. E.—*cont.*
- Land Commission—Fair Rent Appeals, Number outstanding, *July 5*, 246.
- Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1484.
- Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill
  - Eleven O'clock Rule, *Motion* for Suspension of—Procedure as to, *July 5*, 252.
  - *Motion* to commit to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 6*, 414.
- Tyrone, East, New Writ for—*Motion* for Issue of, *July 6*, 362–364.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
- Australia
  - Mail Service, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 505; *July 12*, 1033.
  - Tinned Meat Trade, Regulations for, *July 9*, 488.
- Belfast—Rev. R. D. Patterson, Speech delivered by, *July 9*, 530.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 9*, 592; *July 10*, 804.
- Ennis Assizes, Cases heard at—Condition of County, etc., *July 10*, 729.
- Kinvara Harbour Works, Decision as to, *July 9*, 533.
- Labourers, Ireland, Advances—Resolution, *July 11*, 992.
- Motor Omnibuses, Proposals as to Regulation and Inspection of, *July 16*, 1340.
- Natal Native Rising
  - Bambaata, Alleged Decapitation of Corpse of, *July 16*, 1360.
  - Casualties among White and Black Forces, *July 5*, 214, 215.
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, *July 9*, 534.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
- Africa, Central
  - Forest Conservation—Proposals as to, *July 5*, 213.
  - Labour Recruitment in the Lake Province, *July 4*, 14.
- Africa, East—British Indians, Settlement Rights of, *July 5*, 217, 218.
- Agriculture, Damage done to Crops by Motor Cars, *July 13*, 1234.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1374.
- Foreign Office, Vote for—Discussion of, Inadequate Time granted for, *July 5*, 359; *July 12*, 1074.
- India
  - Bengal—Alleged Boycott of British Goods, *July 9*, 508.
  - Bengal, Eastern—Legislative Council, Representation of Planting Interest, *July 5*, 222.

Rees, Mr. J. D.—*cont.*
- India—*cont.*
  - Indian Languages Examinations, Tabling Regulations for, proposed, *July 5*, 222.
  - Leopards and Tigers, Discontinuance of Rewards for killing, proposed, *July 10*, 717.
  - Natives, Outrages by—Sentences on Assailants of Mr. Earle, and Murderer of Mr. Goss, *July 9*, 509.
  - Railways
    - Raipur-Vizianagram Scheme—Improvement of Vizagapatam Harbour, *July 11*, 874.
    - Rolling Stock, Alleged Inadequacy of, *July 10*, 717.
  - Waste Land, Rules for Reclamation of, *July 4*, 22.
- Natal Native Rising—Discovery of Murdered White Man in Mesini's Kraal, *July 9*, 508.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labourers, Repatriation—"Tremblingly Obey"—Use of Term, *July 4*, 25, 26.
  - Native Labour—Kaffir Employment Statistics, *July 9*, 506.

Reserve Forces Bill
- c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.** *July 9*, 535.

Revenue Bill
- Proposals as to, and Effect of, on Use of Industrial Alcohol.
  - *Q.* Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 6*, 356.

Revenue and Expenditure
- Collection and Expenditure—Return Presented, *July 13*, 1184.

Ribblesdale, Lord
- Horse-breeding—Carrying out Recommendations of Royal Commission, proposed, *July 16*, 1287–1289.

Richards, Mr. T. F. [Wolverhampton, W.]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16* 1407.

Rickett, Mr. J. C. [Yorks W.R., Osgoldcross]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 804, 805.

Ridley, Viscount
- Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 1272.

Rifle Clubs
- Loan of Rifles and Morris Tubes, by War Office, proposed
  - *Q.* Captain K. Smith; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 4*, 14.

Rights of Way (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R.* *July 4*, 60.

Ripon, Marquess of—*Lord Privy Seal.*
Autumn Session, Course of Business during *July 5*, 182, 197.
Bills, House of Lords, Introduction into
Measures promised in the King's Speech, Information as to, *July 5*, 179–183.
Origination of more Measures in the Lords, proposed, *July 5*, 179.
Compulsory Military Service, Proposals as to—Cost of the Scheme, etc., *July 10*, 699, 700.
Defence of the Empire, Navy as Sole Means of—Supplementing by Increased Land Defence, proposed, *July 10*, 698, 699.
Education (England and Wales) Bill—Date of Introduction into the House of Lords—Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 179–181.
London County Council, Financial Methods of—*Status* of Credit, etc., *July 9*, 468–470.
London County Council (Money) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 468–470.
Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill—Date of sending to the Lords, allowing adequate time for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 181.
Plural Voting Bill, Date of Introduction in the House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 182.
Transvaal, Chinese Labourers
Licences, Further Issue of, Reasons for —Policy of the Government, etc., *July 6*, 349.
"Slavery," Allegations of, *July 6*, 348.
Trades Unions and Trade Disputes Bill—Date of Introduction in the House of Lords—Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 182.
Unemployed Workmen Amendment Bill—Policy of the Government as to, *July 5*, 182.
Workmen's Compensation Bill—Date of Introduction in the House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion, etc., *July 5*, 181.

Ritualistic Practices
See Ecclesiastical Discipline.

Ritz Hotel, Limited, Bill
c. 2R.* *July 4*, 2.
*Rep.** *July 12*, 1029.

Roberts, Earl
Army Reserve, Strengthening, Necessity for, *July 10*, 657, 666.
Defence of the Empire
Auxiliary Forces, Unfitness for Home Defence, *July 10*, 663–666.
Expansion Outside Limit of Regular Forces, Necessity for, *July 10*, 656, 664.
Navy as Sole Means of Home Defence—Supplementing by Increased Land Defences, proposed, *July 10*, 658.
Unpreparedness of the Nation for War, alleged, *July 10*, 656–658, 661–667, 673.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
Indian Budget, Facilities for Discussing, *July 10*, 739.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 9*, 548.
Extended Facilities, Procedure in Demanding, etc., *July 9*, 526.
Schools With Extended Facilities—Constitution of Managers, *July 10*, 708.

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Dundee]
"Africa" Trials, Alleged Narrow Escape from Running on Rocks during, *July 9*, 481.
"Britannia" Cadets—Instruction in Handling Open Sailing Boats, proposed, *July 4*, 8.
Dockyards, Maximum and Minimum Number Employed in, Since 1900, *July 9*, 495.
Education and Training—New Scheme—Report by Minister of Marine, *July 9*, 500.
Expenditure, Principal Maritime Powers—Return as to Expenditure during last Ten Years, proposed, *July 4*, 9.
Manœuvres
Merchant Vessels Taking Part in, *July 9*, 483; *July 11*, 865.
Result of, *July 12*, 1045.
"Montagu" Prospects of Floating, etc., *July 4*, 22.
Shipbuilding Statistics (1900–1906), *July 12*, 1032.
Turco-Egyptian Difficulty—British Naval Vessels in the Levant, *July 12*, 1045.
Wei-hai-Wei, Allocation of Vote for, *July 12*, 1045.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland, Tyneside]
- Egypt
  - British Officers, Attack on—Procedure in Trial, etc., *July 12*, 1056.
  - Condition of, Revival of Fanatical Feeling against Europeans, etc., *July 5*, 330.
  - Secondary Schools, Religious Teaching in, *July 16*, 1333.
- India—Bengal, Eastern, Restrictions on Processions, etc., *July 5*, 220.
- Natal Native Rising—Information as to Operations, etc., *July 12*, 1052.
- Transvaal Chinese Labourers—Licences, Information as to, *July 12*, 1051.
- Vaccination Statistics—Examination of Registers, etc., proposed, *July 16*, 1342, 1343.

Robson Sir W. S.—*Solicitor-General* [South Shields]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 93, 94, 96, 127, 128, 135–137 ; *July 9*, 566, 568, 573, 613, 623, 624, 632, 634 ; *July 10*, 753, 779, 789, 797, 798, 803, 826, 827, 832, 833 ; *July 16*, 1401, 1404, 1405.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
- Congested Districts Board, Records kept by, *July 4*, 43.
- Woodford—Prosecution of J. McMahon for not taking out Dog Licence, *July 4*, 53.

Rochester, Chatham and Strood Gas Bill
- *l. Rep.* July 10*, 653.

Rockfield Farm
- Sale Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sullivan ; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*, 1316, 1317.

Rogers, Mr. F. N. [Wilts, Devizes]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1432.

Romney, Earl of
- Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *July 5*, 157.

Roo Estate
- Untenanted Lands, Disposal of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Duffy ; *As.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1070, 1071 ; *July 16*, 1307.

Rosmead, Lord
- Army Reserve Officers called up for Service during South African War—Inquiry into Grievances of, proposed, *July 9*, 471, 472.

Rothamsted
- Agricultural Research Institution at—Grant for, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. L. Hardy, *July 13*, 1212.

Rowlands, Mr. J. [Kent, Dartford]
- Fruit Industry—Reports on Condition of Crops in Holland, France and Germany, during Season, proposed, *July 13*, 1232.
- Handcross Hill Motor Omnibus Accident, Proposals as to Inquiry, etc., *July 12*, 1171.
- Police, Metropolitan, Charge of Intoxication against—Regulation as to Claiming Medical Opinion, *July 16*, 1334

Runciman, Mr. W.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Local Government Board* [Dewsbury]
- Abyssinia, Railway Agreement, Provisions of, *July 9*, 513.
- Africa, West—Portuguese Island of S. Thomé and Principé, Allegations as to Slavery in, *July 5*, 229.
- Aland Islands, alleged Russian Occupation of, *July 9*, 512.
- Congo Free State—Sentence passed on Rev. E. Stannard—Tabling Vice Consul Armstrong's Report, etc., *July 16*, 1305.
- Dalny—alleged Closing to other than Japanese Goods, *July 9*, 510.
- Egypt
  - British Garrison, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 510.
  - British Officers, Attack on
    - Papers, Date of Tabling, *July 16*, 1305.
    - Punitive Measures adopted against Village of Denshawi, *July 16*, 1305.
  - El Azhar University Police Force, Reason for Increasing, *July 16*, 1306.
  - Secondary Schools, Religious Teaching in, *July 16*, 1333.
  - Sersena, Inquiry into Death of Native near—Charges against British Soldiers, etc., *July 16*, 1304.
- Macedonia, Financial Condition, etc., *July 9*, 511.
- Persia
  - Railways—German Application for Concession to Kermanshah, *July 9*, 512.
- Poplar
  - Poor Law Inquiry—Publication of Notes, etc., proposed, *July 4*, 35.
  - Poor Law Schools and receiving House for Children, Cost of, *July 4*, 35.
- Russia—British Fleet, projected Visit of, *July 9*, 512 ; *July 16*, 1333.
- Sinai Peninsula—Progress made with Delimitation of Turco-Egyptian Frontier, *July 16*, 1332.
- Sutton—Outbreak of Enteric Fever at Belmont Imbecile Asylum, *July 4*, 35.

[*cont.*

Runciman, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Switzerland, Vaccination Regulations and Statistics as to Small-pox Cases, *July 4*, 29.
Toxteth Poor Law Relieving Officer, Appointment of, *July 4*, 34.
Turco-Persian Boundary Commission—Date and Place of Meeting in regard to Pasova, *July 9*, 512.
Waterloo Battlefield, alleged Sale of Portion of—Representations to Belgian Government, proposed, *July 16*, 1333.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone, S.]
Belfast—Speech delivered by Rev. R. D. Patterson, *July 9*, 531.
Labourers, Ireland, Advances—Resolution, *July 11*, 991.
Land Commission—Additional Judicial Commissioner, Appointment of, proposed, *July 5*, 246.

Russia
Anti-Semitic Disturbances in, Intervention by Great Britain, proposed.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 5*, 280, 281, 291; Earl Percy, 291, 292; Mr. S. Samuel, 300, 301; Sir E. Grey, 327.
British Fleet, Visit of, during Manœuvres, Objections to.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *July 5*, 280, 281; Mr. J. K. Hardie, 298–300; Mr. S. Samuel, 300, 301; Sir E. Sassoon, 302; Sir E. Grey, 327–330; Lord Monkswell, Lord Fitzmaurice, *July 16*, 1274.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 5*, 228, 229.
Q. Mr. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 9*, 512.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 1333.

Russo-Japanese War
British Vessels seized by Russian Cruisers, Settlement of Claims for.
Q. Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Sir E. Grey; *July 5*, 203.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
Bengal, Eastern, Alleged Repressive Measures against Swadeshi Movement, *July 5*, 221.
Piccadilly Traffic Regulations—Case of J. Scott, *July 13*, 1186.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, West Derby]
Crown Lands (Recovery of Crown Rents)—Resolution, *July 16*, 1446.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1434.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W.—*cont.*
Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1447 1448, 1450.
Toxteth Poor Law Relieving Officer, Appointment of, *July 4*, 34.

Rutherglen Burgh Order Confirmation Bill
c. 2R.* *July 9*, 479.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill
Proposals as to
Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Sloan, *July 9*, 533, 534.

Salisbury, Marquess of
Autumn Session, Proposals as to, *July 5*, 191–194.
Merchant Shipping—British Seamen, Supply and Training of, Departmental Committee of Inquiry into, *July 5*, 171, 172.

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Acts
Annual Report of Proceedings under, Presented, *July 9*, 480; *July 10*, 655.

Saltoun, Lord
Ground Game Bill, *Com.*, *July 12*, 996, 997.
Horse Breeding—Carrying out Recommendations of Royal Commission, proposed, *July 16*, 1289.

Samuel, Mr. S. M. [Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel]
Russia.
  Anti-Semitic Disturbances, Intervention by Great Britain, proposed, *July 5*, 300, 301.
  British Fleet, Visit of, During Manœuvres, Objections to, *July 5*, 300, 301.

Sandes Estate
Purchase Proposals for
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1041.

Sassoon, Sir E. A. [Hythe]
Borneo—Relations between Brunei and Sarawak, *July 5*, 301; *July 9*, 490.
China
  Anhui Mining Final Contracts, enforcing fulfilment of Terms of, etc., *July 5*, 304, 305.
  International Control over, Alleged Attempt of China to Acquire Immunity from, *July 5*, 302–306.
Japan, British Alliance with, *July 5*, 302.
Motor Omnibuses, Proposals as to Regulation and Inspection of, *July 16*, 1339, 1340.

Sassoon, Sir E. A—*cont.*
Russia—British Fleet, Objections to Visit of, during Manœuvres, *July 5*, 302.
Singapore Docks, Cost of acquiring, *July 12*, 1037.

Saunderson, Col. E. J. [Armagh, N.]
Tyrone, East—New Writ, Motion for Issue of, *July 6*, 359–362.

Savings Banks
Naval, *see under* Navy.
Post Office, *see* Post Office Savings Bank.

Schwann, Sir C. E. [Manchester, N.]
Ceylon—Education of Coolie Children, *July 10*, 716.
Singapore Docks, Cost of Acquiring, etc., *July 11*, 869.

Scotland
Secretary for—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.
Solicitor-General, Mr. A. Ure.
See also Names of Places.
Education, *see* Education, Scotland.
Estimates, Opportunity for Discussing.
Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 9*, 529.
Highlands and Islands, Obsolete Naval Vessel as Mercantile Marine Training School for, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 12*, 1066, 1067.
Land Registration System—Substitution of Photo-zincograph for Written Record, proposed.
Q. Mr. E. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 4*, 38.
Rate Arrears, Regulations as to Recovery of.
Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 11*, 859.
Supply, Time Allotted to.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 12*, 1072, 1073.

Scott, Sir S. E. [Marylebone, W.]
Army—Automatic Shortage during next Six Years, *July 10*, 713.

Scottish Union and National Insurance Company Bill
c. Rep. July 5*, 198.
Con. July 10*, 702.
3R.* *July 13*, 1182.
l. Commons' Amendments, *Con.* July 16*, 1242.

Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888
Order Varying Order in respect of Northumberland, Presented, *July 16*, 1275, 1299.

Sea Fisheries Regulation Act, 1888—*cont.*
Report of Proceedings at Annual Meeting of Representatives, Presented, *July 9*, 480; *July 10*, 655.

Sears, Mr. J. E. [Cheltenham]
Dog Tax, Officials Responsible for Assessment of, etc., *July 4*, 29; *July 5*, 239, 240; *July 11*, 874.
Estate Duties
Assessment and Collection, Procedure in, *July 12*, 1058.
Committee, Witnesses Examined by, etc., *July 11*, 863.
Recovery of Omissions and Under-estimates, *July 10*, 726.
Income-tax
Arrears, Regulations as to clearing up, *July 12*, 1031.
Assessment and Collection System, *July 12*, 1033.
Commissioners, Control over Officials, etc., of, *July 10*, 725.
Estimate of Percentage of Assessments corrected during last Five Years, proposed, *July 12*, 1032.
Indian Army—Case of H. J. Penson, *July 5*, 224.
Leckhampton Right of Way Dispute—Sentence on Mr. Barrett, *July 12*, 1059.
Taxation
Assessments—Percentage Revised and Amended, *July 5*, 238.
Revision of present System according to Recommendations of Horsfall Committee, proposed, *July 4*, 30, 31.

Seaverns, Mr. J. H. [Lambeth, Brixton]
Tunbridge Wells—Army Chaplain's Sermon on Education Bill, *July 10*, 714.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.

Secretary of State for India
Rt. Hon. J. Morley.

Secretary for Scotland
Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.

Secretary of State for War
Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.

Seely, Maj. J. E. B. [Liverpool, Abercromby]
- Army Reorganisation Proposals, *July 12*, 1164, 1165.
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com. July 4*, 105.
- Transvaal Chinese Labour—Importation, Date of Stopping, *July 5*, 211.

Servia
- Diplomatic Relations, Conditions of Resumption of, by Great Britain.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *July 10*, 719.

Settled Land Bill
- *l. Com., July 5*, 162.
  - *Rep.* July 6*, 350.
  - 3R.* *July 16*, 1276.
- Amendment made by Select Committee, *July 5*, 163.

Shackleton, Mr. D. [Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com., July 11*, 927.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
- Fatal Accidents and Sudden Deaths Inquiry (Scotland) Bill—Committal to Standing Committee on Trade, *July 4*, 61, 62.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork Co., Mid.]
- Macroom Allotments Scheme, Decision as to, *July 11*, 857.
- Warrenscourt Estate, Sale Proposals for, *July 11*, 857.

Sheehy, Major B., Estate of
- Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. Scanlan.
  - *Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 54, 55.

Sheep Scab
- Dipping of Sheep, Compulsory Order as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. L. Hardy, *July 13*, 1211; Mr. C. Wason, 1234.
- Method of Dealing with Outbreaks of—Policy of Board of Agriculture.
  - *Os.* Mr. L. Hardy, *July 13*, 1210, 1211; Sir E. Strachey, 1228; Mr. C. Warner, 1235.

Sheffield District Railway Bill
- *l.* Commons' Amendments *Con.* July 5*, 158.

Shepton Mallet
- Prison Visiting Committee—Rules Presented, *July 11*, 855; *July 12*, 996.

Shipman, Dr. J. G. [Northampton]
- Local Authorities (Qualifications of Women) Bill, *July 11*, 896.

Shop Hours Act
- Orders made under Presented, *July 11*, 855; *July 12*, 996.

Shoreditch and Stepney Electricity Bill
- *c.* Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *July 16*, 1297.

Shropshire, Worcestershire and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill
- *c.* 2R.* *July 10*, 702, 849.

Sidmouth, Viscount
- Land Tenure Bill—Policy of the Government as to, *July 5*, 183.

Silcock, Mr. T. B. [Somerset, Wells]
- Wells Charities, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 727.

Sinai Peninsula
- Turkish Occupation of, *see under* Egypt.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary for Scotland*, [Forfarshire]
- Achscrabster Allotments, Expense involved in applying for, *July 9*, 495.
- Ardarroch Pier, Grant for, proposed *July 11*, 859.
- Crofters Act Amendment Bill, Date of Introducing, *July 11*, 858.
- Easter Ross—Names of Sheep Farms converted into Deer Forest, *July 5*, 242.
- Education—State-aided Schools, Number of Children Attending, *July 10*, 710.
- Fisheries—Protection, Vessels employed in, *July 10*, 728.
- Glasgow—Barlinnie Prison
  - Accommodation—Allegations as to Overcrowding, etc., *July 16*, 1348
  - Discharge System, *July 12*, 1038.
- Highlands and Islands, Obsolete Naval Vessel as Mercantile Marine Training School, proposed, *July 12*, 1067.
- Land Registration System—Substitution of Photo-zincograph for Written Record, proposed, *July 4*, 38.
- Lewis, Island of
  - Local Taxation, Date of Tabling Report on, *July 4*, 38, 39.
  - Medical Inspector's Report (1895–1904), Date of Tabling, *July 4*, 39.
  - Medical and Sanitary Staff, proposals as to Reorganisation of, *July 4*, 18.
- Lunacy—Scottish Asylum Officials, Superannuation Rights of, *July 16*, 1347.
- Rate Arrears, Regulations as to Recovery f, *July 11*, 859.

Sliddery

Postal Facilities, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Lamont; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 9*, 482.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]

Abbeyleix — Inquiry into Allegations against Head-Constable Spence, *July 6*, 359.

Bann River Drainage, Proposals as to, *July 6*, 358.

Belfast Post Office—Money Orders of Royal Irish Rifles, alleged Inadequate Arrangements for paying, *July 4*, 57.

Education

National School Teachers' Salaries, Proposals as to, *July 4*, 14.

School Building Grants, Decision as to, *July 5*, 359.

Lisburn Workhouse Officials—Decision as to Inquiry, *July 11*, 858.

Malta—Facilities for Protestant Mission Services, *July 5*, 219.

Monastic and Conventual Institutions, Record of Private Burying Grounds of, *July 5*, 231.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Bill, Proposals as to, *July 9*, 534.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire]

Ceylon Pearl Fisheries, Conditions of Leasing, *July 5*, 216, 217.

Smith, Capt., Estate of

Case of A. Beggan.
Q. Mr. McKean; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1070.

Smith, Mr. F. E. [Liverpool, Walton]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 9*, 633.

Schools connected with Institutions, Provisions as to, *July* 4, 19.

Llanelian School Teacher, Salary of, *July 9*, 524.

Smith, Capt. M. K. [Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon]

Rifle Clubs, Loan of Rifles, etc., to, proposed, *July 4*, 14.

Snowden, Mr. P. [Blackburn]

Army Short Service Pension Regulations, Date of cancelling, *July 11*, 864.

Excise Supervisorship Examinations, Information as to, *July 9*, 491.

Wakefield—Fees charged in St. John's School, *July 12*, 1063.

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devon, Barnstaple]

Lights, etc., Advisory Committee, Constitution of, *July 11*, 862.

Railway Rates for Agricultural Produce—Report and Recommendations of Departmental Committee, *July 13*, 1212–1216, 1219, 1220.

Taw and Torridge Estuary, Lighting of, and Dues received for removal of Gravel, *July 11*, 861, 863.

Trinity House, Board of Trade Control over, *July 11*, 862.

Solicitor-General
Sir W. S. Robson.

Solicitor-General for Ireland
Mr. R. Barry.

Solicitor-General for Scotland
Mr. A. Ure.

South African War

Medals for Colonial Troops not actually employed on Active Service—Decision as to.
Os. Earl of Dundonald, *July 10*, 671, 672.

Reserve Officers called up for Service during, Inquiry into Grievances of, proposed.
Os. Lord Rosmead, *July 9*, 471, 472; Earl of Portsmouth, 472, 473.

South Eastern and London Chatham and Dover Railways Bill
c. 2R.* *July 10*, 702.

South Lincolnshire Water Bill
c. 3R.* *July 9*, 478.
l. 1R.* *July 9*, 425.
2R.* *July 16*, 1242.

South Metropolitan Electric Light and Power Bill
c. Order for Second Reading read, etc., and Bill withdrawn, *July 12*, 1027.

South Suburban Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *July 6*, 334.

South Wales Electrical Power Distribution Company Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 10*, 702.
Con. and 3R.* *July 12*, 1027.
l. 1R.* *July 12*, 994.

Southport and Lytham Tramroad (Extension of Time) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 12*, 1028.
*Con.** *July 16*, 1297.

Southwark County Court
Case under Workmen's Compensation Act, Decision of Judge, etc.
Q. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 9*, 513.

Spain
Customs Tariff, New—Translation, etc., Presented, *July 10*, 655, 704.

Sparkbrook Small Arms Factory
See under Army.

Speaker
Bodmin Parliamentary Election — New Writ, Motion for, *July 5*, 252, 253.
Business of the House — Government Business to have Precedence until End of Session, and Adjournment of the House to be made without Question put, *July 13*, 1200.
Labourers, Ireland, Advances—Resolution, *July 16*, 1445.
Matter outside Scope of Subject under Debate, Introduction of, *July 6*, 374.
Questions *see that title.*
Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill.
Eleven o'Clock Rule, Motion for Suspension of—Procedure as to, *July 5*, 251.
Tyrone, East—New Writ, Motion for.
Adjournment of Debate, Motion for, in Order, *July 6*, 364.
House having once refused the Motion, no further Motion could be made during present Session, *July 6*, 364.
Public Notice of, Procedure as to giving, *July 6*, 360.

Speeches, Time Limit for
See under Parliamentary Procedure.

Spicer, Mr. A. [Hackney, Central]
Staines Workhouse—Discontinuance of Practice of allowing Children to watch Visitors to Ascot, proposed, *July 11*, 877.

Staines
Workhouse—Discontinuance of Practice of allowing Children to watch Visitors to Ascot, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Spicer; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 11*, 877, 878.

Stanley of Alderley, Lord
London County Council—Financial Methods of—*Status* of Credit, etc., *July 9*, 463.
London County Council (Money) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 463.

Stanmore, Lord
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Moral Aspect of the Question, *July 6*, 349, 350.

Stockton-on-Tees
Polling Districts in—Order Presented, *July 16*, 1276.

Stone, Sir J. B. [Birmingham, E.]
National Physical Laboratory, Work Undertaken by, *July 13*, 1184, 1185.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somerset, S.]
Cattle
Epizootic Abortion, Committee of Inquiry into, Appointed, *July 13*, 1228.
Holland and Denmark, from, Removal of Importation Restrictions, proposed, *July 13*, 1230.
Importation Restrictions, Removal of, proposed, *July 13*, 1230, 1231.
Channel Islands
Abattoir for Reception of Live Cattle from Argentina, proposed Erection of, *July 13*, 1229, 1230.
Alderney Cattle Importation Regulations — Tabling Correspondence, proposed, *July 5*, 241.
Deptford Cattle Market, Effect of Closing to Foreign Cattle, *July 12*, 1065.
Dogs Bill—Procedure in Claiming Exemptions, *July 12*, 1064.
Epsom—Eviction of Mr. Hodson from North Tadworth Farm, *July 12*, 1066.
Fruit Industry—Reports on Condition of Crops in Holland, France and Germany during Season, proposed, *July 13*, 1229, 1232.
Glanders—Method of dealing with Outbreaks of—Policy of Board of Agriculture, *July 13*, 1227, 1228.
Kew Gardens
Gardeners, Rate of Wages paid to, *July 13*, 1229.
Guide to, Preparation of, proposed, *July 16*, 1312.
Refreshments, Improvement in, proposed, *July 16*, 1312.
Sunday, Hours of Opening on *July 5*, 240, 241; *July 12*, 1064.
Milk Drawn within Three Days after Calving, Restrictions on Sale of, proposed, *July 10*, 725.
Ordnance Survey—Ireland—Place of Printing Maps, *July 16*, 1346, 1347.
Railway Rates on Agricultural Produce, Report and Recommendations of Departmental Committee, *July 13*, 1228.
Sheep Scab, Method of dealing with Outbreaks of—Policy of Board of Agriculture, *July 13*, 1228.
Swine Fever Outbreaks, Inquiry into, *July 13*, 1232.

Straits Settlements
  Singapore.
    Docks, Cost of Acquiring, etc.
      Q. Sir C. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 11*, 869.
      Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1037, 1038.
    Opium Farming System, Alteration in, proposed.
      Qs. Mr. A. Allen; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1326, 1327.

Straus, Mr. B. S. [Tower Hamlets, Mile End]
  Belmont Asylum Enteric Fever Outbreak, Delay in notifying, *July 9*, 520, 521.
  Dalny—Alleged Closing to other than Japanese Goods, *July 9*, 510.

Street Traffic
  Commission, Report.
    Cost of Publishing, etc.
      Qs. Mr. Menzies, Mr. MacNeill; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 9*, 527, 528.
    Delay in Circulating to Members.
      Q. Sir W. Evans-Gordon; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 5*, 232.
  Newspaper Distribution by Cyclists—Danger arising from Reckless Riding, etc.
      Q. Mr. Herbert; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 13*, 1187.

Stretford Urban District
  Light Railway Construction in—Order Presented, *July 5*, 335, 354.

Strikes and Lock-outs, &c.
  Report (1905) Presented, *July 10*, 655, 704.

Stuart, Mr. J. [Sunderland]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 917–919, 943.

Suffolk
  Common Land Inclosures—Return Ordered, *July 11*, 855.

Sullivan, Mr. D. [Westmeath, S.]
  Rockfield Farm, Sale proposals for, *July 16*. 1316.

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill
  c. Order for Second Reading Read, etc., and Bill Withdrawn, *July 6*, 423.

Summerbell, Mr. T. [Sunderland]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 956.
  Kew Gardens.
    Gardeners, Rate of Wages Paid to, *July 13*, 1223.
    Police in, Day of Rest for, proposed, *July 13*, 1224.

Summerbell, Mr. T.—*cont.*
  Whitburn—Complaints as to Tipping Colliery Refuse on Foreshore, *July 5*, 238.

Supply
  Time Allotted for, Inadequacy of, alleged
    Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 1191, 1192; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1196.

Surinam
  Trade Report Presented, *July 16*, 1275.

Surrey
  Inclosures of Common Land—Return Ordered, *July 13*, 1184.

Sutton
  Belmont Imbecile Asylum, Cause of Outbreak of Enteric Fever at.
    Q. Mr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 4*, 35.
    Delay in notifying Outbreak.
      Qs. Mr. Straus, Dr. Cooper; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 9*, 520, 521.

Sutton District Water Bill
  c. *Rep.** *July 4*, 2.
    *Con.** *July 9*, 478.
    3R.* *July 12*, 1027.
  l. 1R.* *July 12*, 994.

Swine
  Erysipelas Epidemic in Wisbech—Compensation to Owners for Animals Destroyed.
    Os. Mr. Beck, *July 13*, 1223.
  Fever
    Method of Inducing.
      Os. Sir C. Rasch, *July 13*, 1234.
    Outbreaks, Inquiry into.
      Os. Mr. A. S. Wilson, *July 13*, 1231; Sir E. Strachey, 1232.

Switzerland
  Vaccination Regulations, Statistics as to Cases of Small Pox, etc.
    Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Haldane *July 4*, 12, 13.
    Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 4*, 28, 29.
    Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Buxton *July 4*, 33.
    Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Lough, *July 4*, 35, 36.

Tabah
  Turkish Occupation of, *see* Egypt—Sinai Peninsula.

Talbot, Mr. J. G. [Oxford University]
  Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 747.

Taw and Torridge Estuary
Gravel, Dues received for Removal of.
  Qs. Mr. Soares; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *July 11*, 861.
Lighting, Control of.
  Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 11*, 863.

Taxation
Assessment and Collection.
  Horsfall Committee, Recommendations of.
    Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 4*, 30, 31.
  Percentage Revised and Amended.
    Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 5*, 238, 239.
  Revision of present System, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Sears; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 4*, 31.
Duties, Taxes, or Imposts, Receipts from, etc., Return Presented, *July 12*, 1030.
Local, Reform of, Government intentions as to dealing with.
  Os. Mr. H. Beach, *July 13*, 1233.
  Q. Mr. Morrell; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *July 16*, 1304.
Return as to Income-Tax, Land Tax, and Inhabited House Duty (1904–1906), Ordered, *July 10*, 705.

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, E. Toxteth]
Ecclesiastical Discipline Commission Report, Opportunity for Discussing, *July 12*, 1072.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 770–773, 775, 779, 780.

Taylor, Mr. J. W. [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
Chester-le-Street—Case of R. Dixon, *July 10*, 722, 724.
Factories Act, Progress made with applying to Home Industries, *July 5*, 231.

Telegraph Service
See also Names of Places.
Wireless Telegraphy, *see that title.*

Tennant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1376–1379, 1390, 1392, 1398, 1399.
Juvenile Offenders, Separate Treatment, etc., for—Legislative proposals, *July 10*, 710.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Home Office—Duties, etc., of Mr. H. H. S. Cunynghame, *July 10*, 722.
Merchant Shipping Amendment Bill, Date of Taking, *July 5*, 235; *July 10*, 739.
Welsh Church
  Disestablishment — Proposals as to Procedure, *July 12*, 1072.
  Inquiry, Reason for appointing, *July 11*, 895.

Thomasson, Mr. F. [Leicester]
Education Board Library, Preparation of Printed Calalogue of, proposed, *July 10*, 706.
Naval Expenditure of Principal Maritime Towers during Last Ten Years—Return, proposed, *July 4*, 8.

Thompson (Clonfin) Estate
Purchase Negotiations for, etc.
  Q. Mr. Cullinan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 247.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.* *July 16*, 1389.
Education—Medical Inspection of Children, proposals as to, *July 9*, 524.

Thornton, Mr. P. M. [Clapham]
Customs Statistical Office—Decision as to Memorial from New Class Assistant Clerks, *July 16*, 1310.
Light Railways Act, 1896, Advances under, *July 5*, 204.

Tibet
Hedin, Dr. S.—Reason for Refusal of Permission to enter Tibet.
  Qs. Earl Percy, Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Morley, *July 5*, 223.

Tin and Black Plate Industry
Inspection System, Revision of, proposed
  Q. Mr. Parker; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 10*, 723.

Tinahely
Post Office Medical Official—Appointment of Dr. J. Bolster.
  Qs. Mr. J. O'Connor; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *July 16*, 1356, 1357.

Todmorden Corporation Bill
*l. Rep.** *July 12*, 993.

Town Tenants (Ireland) Bill
Eleven o'Clock Rule, Motion for Suspension of—Procedure as to.
  Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 5*, 250, 251, 252; Mr. Speaker, 251; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 252; Mr. J. Redmond, 252.
Government Policy as to, Information regarding.
  Os. Mr. C. Craig, *July 6*, 415; Mr A. J. Balfour, 415–417; Mr Cherry, 417, 418; Mr. Campbell 418–420; Sir F. Banbury, 420
Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Law (Mr. McKillop), *July 6*, 414.
Motion to Commit to Standing Committee on Trade (Mr J. Redmond), *July 6* 414.

Toxteth

Poor Law Relieving Officer, Appointment of.
Q. Mr. W. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 4*, 34.

Traction Engines

See under Motors.

Trade, Board of

President—Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. H. E. Kearley.

Trade Reports

Annual Series, Presented, *July 4*, 7; *July 5*, 161; *July 10*, 655, 705; *July 11*, 855; *July 12*, 995; *July 16*, 1275, 1300.

Trade Unions and Trade Disputes Bills

Date of Introduction in the House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion, etc.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 5*, 177; Marquess of Ripon, 182.

Government Attitude towards—Time for Discussion, etc.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *July 13*, 1191, 1195, 1196, 1197; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1196; Mr. K. Hardie, 1199.

Tralee

Telephone Extension proposals.
Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 4*, 19.

Tramways

Steep Hills, Prohibition of Trams on, proposed.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 11*, 876.

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill

l. Rep. July 5*, 160.
3 R.* *July 6*, 334.
c. 1R.* *July 6*, 352.

Transvaal

British Indian Rights—Interpretation of "Native," etc.
Qs. Mr. H. Cox; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1050; *July 16*, 1330.

Chinese Labour

Botha, General, Letter from and Reply to.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 9*, 505.

Cason Mine—Charges against Mr. Jamieson, etc.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A* Mr. Churchill, *July 11*, 871.

Transvaal—*cont.*

Chinese Labour—*cont.*

Corporal Punishment

New Comet Mine Case, Information as to.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 4*, 27.

Witthauer, Decision as to Prosecution of, etc.
Q. Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 4*, 26, 27.

Crimes Committed by, proposals as to dealing with, and protecting white inhabitants.
Os. Bishop of Hereford, *July 6*, 341; Earl of Elgin, 344.

Number of, etc.
Qs. Mr. Alden, Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 11*, 873, 874.

Protection of White People, Measures for, etc.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 11*, 870.

Sentences, Nature of Offences, etc.
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 11*, 868.

Statistics as to
Qs. Mr. Alden, Mr. Trevelyan; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 9*, 506, 507.

Desertions, Number of.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 5*, 213.

Importation, Date of Stopping.
Qs. Major Seely, Mr. Verney; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 5*, 211.
Q. Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1052.

Licences

Further Issue of, Reasons for—Policy of the Government, etc,
Os. Bishop of Hereford, *July 6*, 339, 340, 342; Earl of Elgin, 344–346; Marquess of Lansdowne, 347, 348; Marquess of Ripon, *July 6*, 349.

Names of Firms, etc., to whom issued.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A*, Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1051.

Moral aspect of the Question.
Os. Bishop of Hereford, *July 6*, 342, 343; Lord Stanmore, 349, 350.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
Chinese Labour—*cont.*
Nourse Deep Mine Riot, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 11*, 870.
Repatriation
Amended Notification, Particulars of.
Q. Mr. Churchill, *July 5*, 211.
Draft, Original Proposals for, etc.; *Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 4*, 23, 24.
Local Opinion, Resolutions Received, etc.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 9*, 507, 508.
"Tremblingly Obey"—use of Term in Notification.
Qs. Mr. Paul, Sir H Cotton, Mr. Rees, Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *July 4*, 24-26.
"Slavery," Allegations of.
Os. Bishop of Hereford, *July 6*, 340, 341, 343; Marquess of Lansdowne, 347; Marquess of Ripon, 348.
Statistics as to, Number Repatriated, etc.
Qs. Sir C. Rasch, Viscount Helmsley; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 5*, 212, 213.
Stoppage, Proposals as to—Compensation for Cancelling Existing Contracts, proposed.
Q. Mr. Verney; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1050, 1051.
Gaols, White Men, Kaffirs, and Chinese in.
Qs. Mr. Mackarness; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1052, 1053.
Import Statistics, Return as to, proposed.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1049.
Japanese Rights and Privileges in.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1329.
Johannesburg—Alleged School for Chinamen, Information as to.
Q. Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1053.
Labour in Mines—Further Correspondence, Presented, *July 11*, 855; *July 12*, 995.
Native Labour
Crimes, Statistics as to—Return proposed.
Qs. Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 9*, 507; *July 12*, 1049.
Kaffirs, Statistics as to Employment of.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Mr. Paul; *As.* Churchill, *July 9*, 506.

Transvaal—*cont.*
Native Labour—*cont.*
Recruitment, Encouragement of, proposed
Q. Mr. Verney; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1051.
Wages in Mines in certain Years.
Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 12*, 1050.
Northern Railway Bonds, Value of.
Qs. Sir F. Banbury; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *July 4*, 26.
Rand—Information as to Alleged Outrage on White People by Chinese and Kaffirs.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16*, 1329.
White Labour employed in Mines.
Q. Sir C. Rasch; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 9*, 505, 506.

Trawling
Protection of Fishing Grounds, Vessels employed in.
Q. Mr. Power; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *July 10*, 728.

Treasury
First Lord—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorks, W.R., Elland]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1370–1372.
Transvaal—Chinese Labour—Statistics as to Crimes, *July 9*, 507; *July 11*, 868.
Wells Charities, Proposals as to, *July 10*, 727.

Trinity College, Dublin
See under Ireland.

Trinity House
Board of Trade Control over.
Q. Mr. Soares; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *July 11*, 862.

Truck Act
Dean *v.* Wilson, Decision in Case of—Bringing before Committee on Truck Act, proposed.
Q. Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 1339.

Truck Commission
Progress made by, etc.
Q. Mr. Parker; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 10*, 723, 724.

Trustee Savings Banks
Deficiencies, Vote for, *July 13*, 1237.

Tullycross
Police Barracks, Discontinuance of, proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 16*. 1319.

Tunbridge Wells
Army Chaplain's Sermon on Education Bill, Tenor of.
Q. Mr. Seaverns; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 10*, 714.

Turco Persian Boundary Commission
Date and Place of Meeting in regard to Pasova.
Q. Sir W. Evans-Gordon; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 9*, 512.

Turkey
Baghdad—Trade Report Presented, *July 5*, 161.
Constantinople, H.M. Office of Works at—Foreman appointed without Civil Service Certificate, *July 4*, 7; *July 5*, 161.
Customs Duties, proposed Increase in.
British Trade, Effect on.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 5*, 293.
Conditions imposed by Great Britain.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 5*, 292, 293; Sir E. Grey, 324, 325.
Financial Condition of, Possibility of effecting Reform in.
Os. Earl Percy, *July 5*, 293, 294.

Turnour, Lord [Sussex, Horsham]
Army
Piershill Barracks, Sanitary Condition of, *July 11*, 866.
Preston Barracks—Proposals as to repairing, *July 11*, 866.
Belfast—Speech delivered by Rev. R. D. Patterson, *July 9*, 531.
Railways, Rates on Agricultural Produce—Report and Recommendations of Departmental Committee, *July 13*, 1214, 1216–1219.
Yeomanry Training, Delay in Payment for, *July 11*, 867.

Tweedmouth, Lord — *First Lord of the Admiralty.*
Defence of the Empire—Dissemination of News in War Time, Government Control over, etc., Introduction of Bill, proposed, *July 13*, 1179, 1180.

Twickenham and Teddington Electric Supply Bill
l. *Rep.* July 10*, 653.
3R.* *July 16*, 1242.

Tyndall Estate
Rent Recovery Proceedings, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Mara; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 42, 43.

Tyrone, East
New Writ for *Motion* for Issue of [Col. Saunderson].
Os. Col. Saunderson, *July 6*, 359–362; Mr. Paul, 360; Mr. J. Redmond, 362–364; Mr. Dodd, 364–367; Mr. C. Craig, 367, 368; Captain Craig, 368.

Uganda
Currency—Order in Council, Presented, *July 5*, 334, 353.

Unemployed Workmen Amendment Bill.
Policy of the Government as to.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 5*, 178; Marquess of Ripon, 182.

United States of America
Trade Report Presented, *July 10*, 655.

University College Hospital
Status made by University College Transfer Commissioners, Presented, *July 5*, 335, 354.

University College, London
Statutes made by Senate of University of London, Presented, *July 5*, 335, 353.

University College School, Hampstead
Constitution and Management of—Statutes made by University Transfer Commissioners, Presented, *July 5*, 335, 354.

Uxbridge Gas Bill
l. 3R.* *July 5*, 158.
c. Lords' Amendts., *Con.* July 10*, 701.

Vaccination
Bray, Vann & Bruin, Sentences on—Alteration of Law, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lehmann; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 16*, 1341.
Exemption Certificates.
See also names of places.
Number granted.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 11*, 877.
Palmer, Mr. W. C., Case of.
Q. Mr. Montgomery; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 10*, 710, 711.
Priestley, Mr. S., and Mr. W. Griffiths, Cases of.
Qs. Mr. Lupton, Mr. Brace; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 9*, 515, 516.
Fees for Primary Vaccination, etc.—Revision of Law, proposed.
Q. Mr. Hudson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 9*, 522.
Q. Mr. J. Johnson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 12*, 1062.
National Vaccine Establishment—Source of Supply of Lymph.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 4*, 21.
Pupil Teachers—Regulations as to Conscientious Objection.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 16*, 1345.

[cont.

Vaccination—*cont.*
Statistics—Examination of Registers, etc., proposed.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Mr. Burns, *July 16*, 1342, 1343.

Training Colleges, Vaccination Regulation in.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *July 11*, 881.

Vagrancy
Commission Recommendations, Decision as to Adoption of.
Q. Mr. Brodie; *A.* Mr. Burns, *July 4*, 9.

Verney, Mr. F. W. [Buckinghamshire, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 932.
Transvaal
Chinese Labourers
Existing Contracts, Compensation for cancelling, proposed, *July 12*, 1050.
Importation, Date of stopping, *July 5*, 211.
Native Labour Recruitment, Encouragement of, proposed, *July 12*, 1051.

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]
Africa, South, White Population, Measures taken for Protection of, *July 12*, 1048.
Army
Officers—Shortage in all Branches, *July 12*, 1035.
Personnel, Reductions, Proposals as to, *July 12*, 1171.
Reorganisation Proposals — Opportunity for Adequate Discussion of, prior to carrying into effect, *July 12*, 1171; *July 13*, 1201.
German State Railways, Information as to, *July 9*, 517.
Naval Manœuvres. Result of, *July 12*, 1045.
Railways, British. Statistics as to, *July 9*, 518.

Vivisection
Royal Commission, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 16*, 1335.

Volunteers
Condition of—Unfitness of, for Home Defence.
Os. Earl Roberts, *July 10*, 663–666.
Field Artillery Guns for, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1093.

Volunteers—*cont.*
Functions of—New Scheme for a Territorial Army.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1114–1115, 1166; Sir C. Dilke, 1135–1137; Sir J. Dickson-Poynder, 1141–1143; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1159, 1160.
Inns of Court Rifle Volunteers—Regulation as to Admission of Indian Law Students.
Q. Mr. T. H. Davies; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 4*, 13.
Organisation of, by Means of County Associations, proposed.
Os. Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1115–1117; Sir C. Dilke, 1135, 1136; Sir J. Dickson-Poynder, 1142, 1143.
Organisation and Training of, Necessity for Reform in.
Os. Mr. A. L. Lever, *July 12*, 1152–1154.
Postal Employees, *see* Post Office—Volunteers.

Wakefield
St. John's School, Fees charged in, etc.
Q. Mr. Snowden; *A.* Mr. Lough, *July 12*. 1063.

Wales, Church of
Disestablishment—Proposals as to Procedure.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 12*, 1072.
Inquiry, Reason for appointing, etc.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 11*, 895,

Walker, Col. W. H. [Lancashire, S.W., Widnes]
Militia Garrison Artillery, Proposals as to, *July 16*, 1322.

Walrond, Mr. L. [Devonshire, Tiverton]
Schools promoted by other than Local Education Authorities, Number of, *July 9*, 494.

Walton, Sir J. L.—*Attorney-General* [Leeds-S.]
Ecclesiastical Discipline Commission—Recommendation as to Meeting of Two Convocations, *July 12*, 1073.
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 4*, 75–77.
Great Yarmouth Parliamentary Election Petition—Proceedings at Trial, Allegations against Mr. Justice Grantham, *July 6*, 391–402.
Political Bias and Partisanship, Charges of, *July 6*, 395–399.
Jury Trials — Introduction of Scottish System, proposed, *July 5*, 240.
Lockerbie Town Hall Bazaar, alleged Raffling at, *July 11*, 856.

[*cont.*

Walton, Sir J. L.—*cont*
- Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1454, 1465, 1468, 1469, 1486.
- Post Office Sites Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1449.

Warboys (Union of Districts) Drainage Bill
- *c. Rep.** *July 5*, 198.
- *Con.** *July 11*, 853.
- 3R.* *July 16*, 1297.

War Office
- *Secretary of State* —Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
- *Parliamentary Under-Secretary*—Earl of Portsmouth.
- *Financial Secretary*—Mr. T. R. Buchanan.
- Meat Contracts
  - "Home-Killed" substituted for "Home-Bred," Saving effected by. *Os.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12*, 1110.
  - Specifications in—Increasing Number of Army Stations for Slaughtering Cattle, proposed. *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 16*, 1308.

Ward, Mr. J. [Stoke-on-Trent]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 818.
- Shropshire, Worcestershire and Staffordshire Electric Power Bill, 2R., *July 10*, 849–852.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labour, Importation, Date of Stopping, *July 12*, 1052.
  - Johannesburg, Alleged School for Chinamen in, *July 12*, 1053.

Warde, Col. C. E. [Kent, Medway]
- Motor Dust Nuisance, Proposals for dealing with, *July 4*, 21.

Wardle, Mr. G. J. [Stockport]
- Birmingham—Inquiry into Death of Mr. Yardley at Vauxhall Station, *July 5*, 234.
- London and South Western Railway Company—Penalties on Engine Drivers, *July 5*, 233, 234.
- Railways—Banking Trains up Inclines by uncoupled Engines, Dangers of, *July 5*, 235.

Waring Estate
- Reinstatement Claim of S. Caldbeck. *Q.* Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 9*, 485.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T. [Staffordshire, Lichfield]
- Education (England and Wales) Bill—Grant, Proposals as to Distribution of, *July 9*, 493.

Warner, Mr. T. C. T.—*cont.*
- Sheep Scab, Method of dealing with Outbreaks of—Policy of Board of Agriculture, *July 13*, 1235.

Warrenscourt Estate
- Sale, Proposals for. *Q.* Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July* 11, 857.

Wason, Mr. E. [Clackmannan and Kinross]
- Jury Trials, English—Introduction of Scottish System, proposed, *July 5*, 240.
- Scottish Land Registration System—Substitution of Photo-Zincograph for Written Record, proposed, *July 4*, 38.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
- Africa, East—Proposals as to Legislative Council, etc., *July 16*, 1327.
- Dogs Bill—Procedure in Claiming Exemptions, *July 12*, 1063.
- Highlands and Islands—Obsolete Naval Vessel as Mercantile Marine Training School, proposed, *July 12*, 1066.
- Motor Traffic
  - Regulation of, *July 9*, 522.
  - Speed Regulation—Applications received from Local Authorities, *July 12*, 1062.
- Nigeria, Chief Nana, Decision as to Return of, *July 16*, 1328.
- Scottish Supply, Time allotted to, *July 12*, 1072.
- Sheep Scab—Dipping of Sheep, Compulsory Order as to, *July 13*, 1234.

Water Provisional Order Bill
- *l.* Bill not to be Proceeded with, *July 16*, 1242.

Waterford Corporation and Bridge Bill
- *c.* Lords' Amendments, *Con.** *July 9*, 478.

Waterloo
- Battlefield, alleged Sale of Portion of—Representations to Belgian Government, proposed. *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *July 16*, 1333.

Watford Gas Bill
- *l. Rep.** *July 10*, 653.
- 3R.* *July 16*, 1242.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *July 12*, 993.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow, College]
- Glasgow—Barlinnie Prison Accommodation, allegations as to Overcrowding, etc., *July 16*, 1347.

Wei-Hai-Wei
Report (1905) Presented, *July 10*, 655, 704.
Vote for, Allocation of.
Q. Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *July 12*, 1045.

Weights and Measures
Uniform System for British Empire—Investigation of Question, proposed.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Sir. H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 16*, 1359.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
Aldershot Canteens, alleged Short Weight in Goods sold at, *July 12*, 1044.
Ardarroch Pier, Grant for, proposed, *July 11*, 859.
Assam—Alleged Execution of Reprieved Prisoner, *July 4*, 12.
Crofters Act Amendment Bill, Date of Introducing, *July 11*, 858.
Easter Ross—Names of Sheep Farms converted into Deer Forest, *July 5*, 242.
India
Bengal, Eastern, Condition of, *July 4*, 12.
Judicial and Executive Functions, Separation of, proposed, *July 4*, 11.
Railways—Reconnaissance of Routes for Vizamgam-Malia Line, *July 5*, 202.
Lewis, Island of
Local Taxation, Date of Tabling Report on, *July 4*, 38, 39.
Medical Inspector's Report (1895–1904) Date of Tabling, *July 4*, 39.
Medical and Sanitary Staff, Proposals as to Reorganisation of, *July 4*, 17.
Rate Arrears, Regulations as to Recovery of, *July 11*, 859.

Welby, Lord
Corporation of London (Blackfriars and other Bridges) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 1269–1271, 1273.
London County Council.
Electric Supply Undertakings, Excess of Expenditure over Estimate, *July 9*, 442.
Financial Committee of — Recommendation of, Ignored, alleged, *July 9*, 438–440.
Financial Methods of—*Status* of Credit, etc., *July 9*, 444–446.
Housing Schemes, Buildings, etc.—Excess of Expenditure over Estimate, etc., *July 9*, 442.
Loans, Borrowing Powers for £12,224,000, *July 9*, 444.

Welby, Lord—*cont.*
London County Council—*cont.*
Main Drainage Schemes, Cost of, *July 9*, 446.
Steamboat Service, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates and Receipts, *July 9*, 440.
Tramway Services, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates and Receipts, *July 9*, 441.
Undertakings of, Excess of Expenditure over Estimates, *July 9*, 440–444.
London County Council (Money) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 438–448, 458, 460.

Wells
Llewellyn's and Charles's Charities, proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Silcock; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *July 10*, 727.

Wemyss, Earl of
Army, Mobilisation in Event of War, Arrangements for Experimental Mobilisation of one Command to Test Arrangements, proposed. *July 9*, 474, 475.
London County Council (General Powers) Bill, 3R., *July 16*, 1259–1262.

West Yorkshire Tramways Bill
c. Rep. July 5*, 198.
Con. July 16*, 1297.

Westmeath
Untenanted Land, Inquiry into, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 12*, 1035.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill
c. Rep. July 12*, 1028.

Whitburn
Foreshore, Complaints as to Colliery Refuse Tipped on.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *July 5*, 238.

White, Mr. G. [Norfolk, N.W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 10*, 800; *July 11*, 900–902, 905; *July 16*, 1432.

White, Mr. J. D. [Dumbartonshire]
Ceylon Pearl Fisheries, Conditions of Leasing, *July 4*, 27.
Musical Copyright Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1459, 1468.
Patent Agents—Number Registered, Names Erased, etc., *July 11*, 860.
Wireless Telegraphy Bill, Lords' Amendts., *Con.*, *July 13*, 1205, 1206.

Whiteley, Mr. G.—*Parliamentry Secretary of the Treasury* [Yorks., W.R., Pudsey]
Bodmin Parliamentary Election, New Writ—Motion for, *July 5*, 252, 253.

Wicklow
Magistracy, Religion of.
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 5*, 243.

Williams, Col. R. [Dorset, W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.* *July 11*, 937, 951; *July 16*, 1431.

Williams, Mr. A. O. [Merionethshire]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 970.

Williams, Mr. J. [Glamorgan, W.]
Coal Mines in South Wales, Inspection of, *July 4*, 31.
Pontardawe Medical Officer of Health—Appointment of Dr. G. Griffiths, *July 16*, 1341.

Williamson, Mr. A. [Elgin & Nairn]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 16*, 1391.
Findhorn Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *July 11*, 878.

Wilson, Mr. A. S. [Yorks., E.R., Holderness]
Swine Fever Outbreaks, Inquiry into, *July 13*, 1231.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 950; *July 16*, 1433.

Winchester, Bishop of
Tidworth Barracks—Hospital, Church, and Recreation Room Accommodation, proposals as to, *July 6*, 338.

Winfrey, Mr. R. [Norfolk, S.W.]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 931.

Wireless Telegraphy
Applications for Licences, etc., Return, Date of Circulating.
Q. Mr. H. C. Lea; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 4*, 19.
Lloyds, Number of Licences Issued to.
Q. Mr. Beauchamp; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *July 4*, 33, 34.

Wireless Telegraphy Bill
c. Lords Amendts., *Con.*, *July 13*, 1202.
Lords' Amendment, proposals for Discussing.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *July 9*, 529, 530.

Wirral Railway (Extension of Time) Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 12*, 1028.

Wolff, Mr. G. W. [Belfast, E.]
Great Northern Railway (Ireland) Bill, 2R., *July 9*, 650, 651.

Wolstanton United Urban District Gas Bill
c. *Rep.** *July 6*, 351.
*Con.** *July 12*, 1027.

Women
Enfranchisement of—Disturbance by Suffragettes in Cavendish Square, Sentences inflicted, etc.
Os. Mr. K. Hardie, Dr. Cooper, Mr. C. Duncan, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Cremer, *July 5*, 330–332.
Qs. Mr. Snowden, Mr. K. Hardie. *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *July 5*, 232, 233.

Wood, Mr. T. M. [Glasgow, St. Rollox]
Glasgow—Barlinnie Prison Discharge System, *July 12*, 1038.

Woodford
McMahon, J., Prosecution of, for not taking out Dog Licence.
Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 53.
United Irish League Meeting, Speeches made at.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Bryce, *July 4*, 52.

Woodhouse, Sir J. T. [Huddersfield]
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.*, *July 11*, 942, 945, 949, 951; *July 16*, 1374.

Worcester
Parliamentary Election Petition—King's Answer to the Address, *July 5*, 333; *July 10*, 701.

Workmen's Compensation Bill
Date of Introduction in the House of Lords, Opportunity for Discussion, etc.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *July 5*, 177; Marquess of Ripon, 181

Workmen's Trains
Committee Recommendations, Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *July 9*, 518, 519.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S. [Sheffield, Hallam,
Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com.* *July 9*, 537; *July 10*, 743, 779.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G. [Dover]

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com. July 4,* 73, 143; *July 9,* 601, 602; *July 16,* 1401, 1403, 1404.

Yeomanry

Divisional Troops, Utilisation as, on Mobilisation, Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Haldane, *July 12,* 1097, 1098; Sir C. Dilke, 1134.

Drill Book—Revision of present Instructions proposed.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 16,* 1308, 1309.

Lothians and Berwickshire Regiment—Appointment of Lord Binning to Command of.
Q. Mr. Crombie; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *July 12,* 1036.

Training—Payment, Reason for Delay in.
Qs. Lord Turnour, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Buchanan, *July 11,* 867.

Yorkshire

Polling Districts in West Riding—Order Presented, *July 16,* 1276, 1299.

Young, Mr. S. [Cavan, E.]

Coolkill—Reinstatement Claim of F. Reilly. *July 12,* 1042.

Young, Mr. S.—*cont.*

Magistrates, Irish, Fees on Appointment of, *July 10,* 732.

Mullycastle—Reinstatement Claim of Mr McEvoy, *July 12,* 1063.

Younger, Mr. G. [Ayr Burghs]

Edinburgh Inspectors of Taxes Office—Pension Claim of Clerk, *July 6,* 357.

Fatal Accidents (Scotland) Bill—Proposals as to Transfer of Members of Grand Committee on Law, *July 9,* 528.

Yoxall, Mr. J. H. [Nottingham, W.]

Education

Code—Interpretation of Article 38 (IV.), *July 12,* 1040.

Fire Drill, Regulations as to Counting Time spent in, *July 12,* 1039.

Education (England and Wales) Bill, *Com. July 10,* 777; *July 11,* 940, 941; *July 16,* 1419.

Zanzibar

Slavery on the Mainland, Proposals for Abolition of.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *July 16,* 1332.
